ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು.— ಅದಕ್ಕೆ ಉತ್ತರ ಬರೆದಿದ್ದೇನೆ. ಅದನ್ನು ಪ್ರಸ್ತಾಪಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಇಲ್ಲಿ ಆಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಎಂ. ಎಸ್. ಪಟ್ಟಣ್.— ಅದು ಜನರ ಬೇಡಿಕೆ ವಿಚಾರ............

ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು.— ಆ ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆ ಬರುವುದಿಲ್ಲ ಅದಕ್ಕೆ ಉತ್ತರ ಬರೆದಿದ್ದೇವೆ. ಅದನ್ನು ಸದಸ್ಯರು ನೋಡಿಕೊಳ್ಳಲಿ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಎಂ. ಎಸ್. ಪಟ್ಟಣ್.— ಅದನ್ನು ನೋಡಿಕೊಂಡಿದ್ದೇನೆ. ಇಷ್ಟು ಜನರ ಒತ್ತಾಯ ಬೇಡಿಕೆಗೆ, ಚರ್ಚೆಗೆ ಅಸ್ಪದ ಕೊಡಿರಿ.

ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು.— ನಿಬಂಧನೆಗಳ ಪರಿಪಾಲನೆಯು ತಮ್ಮ ನಿಲುವಳಿ ಸೂಚನೆಗೆ ಅನುಮತಿ ಕೊಟ್ಟಿಲ್ಲ. ಆದುದರಿಂದ ತಾವು ಅದನ್ನು ಪ್ರಸ್ತಾಪ ಮಾಡಬಾರದು ಎಂದು ಭಿನ್ನೈಸುತ್ತೇನೆ. ತಾವು ಕುಳಿತು ಕೇಳಿ.

Sri M. C. NARASIMHAN.—It is only hunger strikes and strikes that cannot form subject-matter of an adjournment motion. For example the Punjabi Subha demand was taken up in the Parliament.

Mr. SPEAKER.—It was allowed because of a statement made by the Minister. There can be no adjournment motion but the Minister may make a statement.

Sri M. C. NARASIMHAN.—Our rules do not say anything about this.

Mr. SPEAKER.—The rulings of all Legislative Assemblies are clear on the point.

Sri M. C. NARASIMHAN.—Does it apply to all agitations or specifically to strikes and hunger strikes ?

Mr. SPEAKER.—It applies to all agitations. Now we will take up the clause by clause consideration of the Land Reforms Bill.

MYSORE LAND REFORMS BILL, 1961 AS REPORTED BY JOINT SELECT COMMITTEE CLAUSE BY CLAUSE CONSIDERATION —*Contd.*

Clause 63

Sri KADIDAL MANJAPPA (Minister for Revenue).—I beg to move

"(1) That for sub-clause (1) the following sub-clauses shall be substituted:—

"No person either by himself or, if he has a family or is member of a joint family, together with anyother member of his family or his family or of the joint family, as the case may be, shall, whether as a land-owner, landlord or tenant or as a mortgagee with possession or otherwise, or partly in one

capacity and partly in any other, hold land in excess of the ceiling area:—

Provided that where the number of members of the family of such person or of the joint family of which such person is a a member exceeds five, he or the joint family, as the case may be, may hold six additional standard acres for each member in excess of five, so however as not to exceed twice the ceiling area in the aggregate.

Explanation:—In the case of a company, association or any other body of individuals, the ceiling limit shall be one ceiling area.

(2) In the case of any person holding land on the appointed day, other than a person holding land cultivated by plantation crops, the provisions of sub-section (1) shall apply as if the ceiling area were twenty-seven standard acres.

(3) In determining ceiling limit under this section, forest land exclusively used on the appointed day, for grazing the cattle of the holder of the land or on which trees have been raised for better cultivation of the land, shall not be taken into consideration to the extent of thirty acres:

Provided that when any such land ceases to be used for the said purpose, or is used for any other purpose, or the grass or other produce grown thereon is sold, such land shall be taken into consideration for determining the ceiling limit.

(4) In the case of any person holding land cultivated by plantation crops, the ceiling limit in respect of others land held by him shall be determined taking into consideration the agricultural land referred to in item (3) of the Explanation to section 104."

8. Sub-clause (2) shall be renumbered as sub-clause (5) and in sub-clause (5) as renumbered:—

(i) for the words, figure and brackets "sub-section (1)" the words, figures and brackets "sub-sections (1) and (2)" shall be substituted.

(ii) item (*a*) with the explanation shall be deleted; and

(iii) items (*b*), (*c*), (*d*) and (*e*) shall be relettered as items (*a*), (*b*), (*c*) and (*d*) respectively.

9. After sub-clause (5), as renumbered, the following sub-clausesshall be added:—

"(6) Where a person holds both land exempted under clauses (*c*) or (*d*) of sub-section (5) (hereinafter called 'exempted land') and other land (that is, not so exempted), then:—

(*a*) if the area of exempted land is less than ceiling area, he shall be entitled to hold so much only of other land as together with the area of exempted land, equals the ceiling area; and in

(Sri KADIDAL MANJAPPA)

such case, in relation to the holding of that person, such area shall be deemed to be the ceiling area:

(b) in any other case, he shall not be entitled to hold any land which is not exempted land.

(7) Nothing in this section shall apply to any land held by a religious, charitable or other institution capable of holding property when such land is cultivated personally by such institution."

MR. SPEAKER.— Amendment moved :

"(1) That for sub-clause (1) the following sub-clause shall be substituted.—

"(1) No person either by himself or he has a family or is a joint family, together with any othe member of his family or of the joint family, as the case may be, shall, whether as a land-owner, landlord or tenant or as a mortgagee with possession or otherwise, or partly in one capacity and partly in any other, hold land in excess of the ceiling area.—

Provided that whether the number of members of the family of such person or of the joint family of which such person is a member exceeds five, he or the joint family, as the case may be, may hold six additional standard acres for each member in excess of five, so however as not to exceed twice the ceiling area in the aggregate.

Explanation.—In the case of a company, an association or any other body of individuals, the ceiling limit shall be one ceiling area.

(2) In the case of any person holding land on the appointed day, othar than a person holding land cultivated by plantation crops, the provisions of sub-section (1) shall apply as if the ceiling area were twenty-seven standard acres.

(3) In determining the ceiling limit under this section, forest and and exclusively used on the appointed day, for grazing the cattle of the holder of the land or on which trees have been raised for better cultivation of the land, shall not be taken into consideration to the extent of thirty acres :

Provided that when any such land ceases to be used for the said purpose, or is used for any other purpose, or the grass or other produce grown there on is sold, such land shall be taken into consideration for determining the ceiling limit.

(4) In the case of any person holding land cultivated by plantation crops, the ceiling limit in respect of other land held by him shall be determined taking into consideration the agricultural land referred to in item (3) of the Explanation to Section 104."

8. Sub-clause (2) shall be renumbered as sub-clause (5) and in sub-clause (5) as renumebered :—

(i) for the words, figure and brackets "sub-section (1)" the words, figures and brackets "sub-sections (1) and (2)" shall be substituted.

(ii) item (*a*) with the explanation shall be deleted ; and

(iii) items (*b*), (*c*), (*d*) and (*e*) shall be relettered as items (*a*), (*b*), (*c*) and (*d*) respectively.

9. After sub-clause (5), as renumbered, the following sub-clause shall be added.—

"(6) Where a person holds land exempted under clause (*c*) or (*d*) of sub-section (5) (hereinafter called 'exempted land other land') and other land (that is, land which is not so exempted), then.—

(*a*) If the area of exempted land is less than ceiling area, he shall be entitled to hold so much only of other land as together with the area of exempted land, equals the ceiling area ; and in such case, in relation to the holding of that persons, such area shall be deemed to be the ceiling area ;

(*b*) in any other case, he shall not be entitled to hold any land which is not exempted land.

(7) Nothing in this section shall apply to any land held by a religious, charitable or other institution capable of holding property when such land is cultivated personally by such institution."

Sri M. C. NARASIMHAN (K. G. F.).—Sir may I suggest that this clause be taken a little laters. I have moved an amendment to amendment which is being typed in the office.

Mr. SPEAKER.—We will take up clause 64 now.

Clause 64.

Sri KADIDAL MANJAPPA.—I beg to move :

"That for the two provisos in clause 64, the following proviso shall be substituted.—

Provided that in respect of land required for growing sugar–cane by a sugar factory, the ceiling limit permissible under this section shall be one-sixth of the minimum area of the land which, in the opinion of the State Government, is required to feed the said factory".

Mr. SPEAKER.—Amendment moved :

"That for the two provisos in Clause 64, the following proviso shall be substituted.—

Provided that in respect of land required for growing sugarcane by a sugar factory, the ceiling limit permissible under this section shall be one-sixth of the minimum area of

(Mr. SPEAKER)

the land which, in the opinion of the State Government, is required to feed the said factory".

†Sri KADIDAL MANJAPPA.—This is a simple amendment. The amendment is there even in the proviso. The intention is to retain the clause relating to sugar factory and to delete the rest of it. The object is clear. There are two provisos under clause 24. We have now taken the decision that plantation should be exempt even from the operation of future ceilings. Therefore the second proviso should go. Since we have taken a decision that plantations are exempt from the ceiling altogether, the first proviso is also unnecessary because it deals with plantations which have been kept in tact.

Sri M. C. NARASIMHAN.—Where is it said that future ceiling applies only to Co-Operative sugar factories? The proviso does not make any difference between a Co-Operative sugar factory or any other factory.

Sri KADIDAL MANJAPPA.—This is not newly proposed; it is there. I want to retain it by substituting this to the two provisos.

Sri V. SRINIVASA SHETTY (Coondapur).—Sir, I beg to move, amendment to the amendment.

"That in the proposed proviso for the words 'one sixth' the word 'half' shall be substituted."

Mr. SPEAKER.—Amendment to the amendment moved:

"That in theproposed proviso for the words 'one sixth' the word 'half' shall be substicuted."

Sri V. SRINIVASA SHETTY.—Sir, I find that invidious distinction is madebetween certain categories of land. I know a few sugar factories which are about to be closed for lack of lands.

Sri B. D. JATTI (Chief Minister).—There is not a single sugar factory which is to be closed for lack of land.

Sri V. SRINIVASA SHETTY.—May I ask the Chief Minister about the position of supply of sugar cane in Shimoga?

Sri KADIDAL MANJAPPA.—The Shimoga sugar factory is not in a mood to close because they are getting enough supply.

Sri B. D. JATTI.—2,500 acres were granted by the Mysore Government and all that land is brought under cultivation and they get sufficient sugarcane.

Sri SRINIVASA SHETTY.—My information was, the land they have got was insufficient and hence it is to be closed. I was told that this is the case in respect of other factories also. This is subject to correction. Sir, when the price of sugar or jaggery is high, the villagers cultivate more sugarcane and if the price falls, the cultivation goes down. Private parties are not in a position to supply sugarcane to these factories. They must have a guarantee to get the supply.

---

†Indicates that the remarks or speeches have not been revised by the Member concerned.

Sri KADIDAL MANJAPPA.—Sir, according to Section 64, first proviso, a plantation which was exemp ed from the ceiling on the appointed day can be sold in tact though it exceeds the ceiling limit. Even if the plantation consisted of thousand acres, it can be sold in tact, to any person without attracting the provisions relating to the ceiling for future acquisition. Now, we have taken a decision to exempt plantation in toto from the operation of the present ceiling or future ceiling and there is no need for this provision.

12-30 P.M.

The second proviso relates to ceiling in respect of plantation for future acquisitions. In view of the decision that the plantations should be exempted altogether from the ceiling there is no need for the second proviso. The clause relating to ceiling in respect of sugar factories is proposed to be retained. Therefore, I have proposed that item (*b*) in the second proviso be substituted for the entire two provisos.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA (Nanjangud).—I want to know, why have you come to the conclusicn that it should be one sixth. You say:

> "...the celling limit permissible under this section shall be one-sixth of the minimum area of the land which, in the opinion of the State Government, is required to feed the said factory."

That is the explanation that we want.

Sri KADIDAL MANJAPPA.—Because when we start a sugar factory in any area, it is not only sugar industry or industrialist that should be benefited but also the agriculturists in the area should have some benefit on account of the installation of the factory. Take the case of the Thungabhadra Sugar Factory at Shimoga. If we say that half the area should be exempted, the raiyats will not be benefited. There is that raiyats who grow sugar cane crops should get the benefit on account of starting of the industry. Therefore it is proposed to one sixth.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—Sir, possibly the Hon'ble is not making himself clear. Why should it be fixed at one-sixth of the total area which in the opinion of the State Government is necessary to feed the factory. Supposing the other raiyats fail to comply with the requistion of the management of the factory, what happens?

Sri KADIDAL MANJAPPA.—They have to buy sugarcane from the raiyats?

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—You are aware that in Mandya there is what is called '*oppige*' and *non-oppige*' arrangements.

Sri KADIDAL MANJAPPA.—I know the Pandavapura Factory is not in a position to take all the sugarcane supplied to it.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—That is because of the fact that you and the Government have created sugar scarcity. For future purposes on what basis this figure of one-sixth is fixed? Is it arbitrary or is based on any rationale? On what basis was it fixed. That is the explanation that I want. Are they now purchasing 5/6 of the requirements from raiyats ?

Sri KADIDAL MANJAPPA.—Yes. In some cases, they are purchasing 5/6. If my recollection is correct one-sixth of the area is to be exempted in other Acts also. I have not proposed any new amendment Sir. That was incorporated in the original Bill as well as the Select Committee Report.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—Is there no rationale behind the fixation of certain minimum. I do not dispute it may be in the original Bill and may have been there in the report of the Select Committee.

Sri KADIDAL MANJAPPA.—Government feels that one-sixth should be sufficient and the rest of the requirements should be purchased by the raiyats. That is the rationale.

† Sri M. C. NARASIMHAN.—Sir, I expected that the Hon'ble Revenue Minister would justify this particular amendment, because in the original Bill there is no such reference. Section 71 of the original Bill did not provide for this ceiling limit as provided for in the proposed proviso. But so for as sugar factories are concerned, there was no reference at all in the original Bill. On the first reading of the Bill, we never expected it would come in this fashion. I expected the Revenue Minister would give us some reasons for this change. I think it is customary that whenever such clause are inserted, if there is a departure from the original Bill made by the select committee, some reasons should be given to the House. He is not revealing any fact at all.

Sri KADIDAL MANJAPPA.—I am sorry my Hon'ble friend has not read the original Bill properly. I would like to draw his attention to Section 72 of the original Bill.

Sri M. C. NARASIMHAN.—Sir, so for as sugarcane farms are concerned, I will read from the Jatti Committee Report.

> "We do not consider that sugarcane farms operated by sugar factories qualify for exemption. If these factories have to serve the real purpose of improving the economic condition of the agriculturists in the area served by them they must purchase the bulk of their requirements of sugarcane from the growers. Encouragement of factory farms will lead to the cultivators being reduced to the level of labourers. We are therefore, of the view that no sugar factory should own more than 1/6th of the area required to feed it. This 1/6th of the area should suffice for running demonstration plots, and to grow sets for supply to ryots. Co-operative sugar factories which take lands of the members, on lease for cultivation on a co-operative basis may, however, be exempted from the operation of the ceiling so far as the area taken on lease is concerned."

Even here, why it was arbitrarily chosen as one-sixth is not known. Was it the opinion of the Jatti Committee that all the factories required only one-sixth and 5/6th of their requirements could be secured from private sources, is a thing which is not clear. I will make the position further clear. Let us see the position in the neighbouring State. So far as Andhra is concerned, in section 16 of the Andhra Ceilings Act, sugarcane factories are totally exempted whether in the Co-operative sector or the private sector. In Madras, Section 37 provides for decision of these matters by sugar factory board in respect of land to be used for cultivation of sugarcane.

There the scheme is different and it is not arbitrarily fixed as one-sixth. Here there is a distinction made between a sugar factory as owner of the plot of land and a sugar factory as tenant and there are certain provisions which apply differently in each case. If the sugar factory itself is a landlord owning the particular plot that is needed for sugarcane cultivation then the ceiling limit is different. In this connection I would like to invite the attention of the Minister to the Madras provision. In Madras the whole matter has to be decided by a Sugar Factory Board consisting of the representatives of the State Government presided over by a judicial officer. The Sugar Factory Board is required to go in to all the relevant factors. There they have not fixed any arbitrary figure as one-sixth and so we are not able to understand the rationale behind the provision here. Another interesting thing is that in Maharashtra which is one of the premier sugar producing centres there is no provision for exemption from the ceiling and the sugar factories come within the ambit of the operation of the Maharashtra Ceiling Act, 1961. When the Government of India encourages sugar factories even in the private sector, I am not able to understand the rationale behind this provision. In Kerala also so far as I know there is no exemption and that Act has received the assent of the President after scrutiny by the Planning Commission and the Agriculture Ministry of the Government of India. In the face of it I do not see any reason why there should not be a uniform policy in regard to this matter. Even supposing we fix it at one-sixth, when the neighbouring State of Madras has placed it on a different footing and Andhra has exempted it, are we not placing our sugar factories at a disadvantageous position as against these States? You may say that Maharashtra factories are faced with a bigger disadvantage, but that is all the more reason why there should be a uniform policy adopted by the Government of India in respect of a crop like sugarcane and sugar which is required to be exported. Either there should be no exemption at all or there should be specific exemption. The provision as is suggested now leads to an anamolous position so far as the sugar factories in Mysore are concerned. And this provision is likely to be attached as being arbitrary especially in view of the fact that in the third plan period we are thinking of starting two are three more sugar factories in the Co-operative and also the private sector. I would personally prefer

(Sri M. C. NARASIMHAN)

that this proviso should be deleted or alternatively there should be no restriction in the matter of ceiling area. I do not think that the Jatti Committee has bestoved sufficient attention to this aspect. Coming as the Chief Minister does from the former Bombay area, I do not know why that Committee did not bestow sufficient attention to this and recommed either total exemption or no exemption.

†ಶ್ರೀ ಸಿ. ಜೆ. ಮುಕ್ಕಣ್ಣಪ್ಪ (ಗುಬ್ಬಿ).—ಸ್ವಾಮಿ, ನಮ್ಮ ಕಂದಾಯಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳು ಬಹಳ ಔದಾರ್ಯ ತೋರಿಸಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಆದರೆ ಇದೇ ರೀತಿಯಾಗಿ ಬಡವರಿಗೆ ಜಮೀನು ಇಲ್ಲದವರಿಗೆ ಜಮೀನು ಕೊಡುವ ಔದಾರ್ಯ ತೋರಿಸಲಿಲ್ಲ. ಕಬ್ಬು ಬೆಳೆಯುವವರು ಸಕ್ಕರೆ ಕಂಪನಿಗಳಿಗೆ ಕಬ್ಬು ಸಪ್ಲೈ ಮಾಡುವುದರಿಂದ ಚೆನ್ನಾಗಿ ಬೆಲೆ ಸಿಕ್ಕುತ್ತದೆ ಮತ್ತು ಶ್ರೀಮಂತರಾಗುತ್ತಾರೆ ಆದಕ್ಕೋಸ್ಕರ ಸಕ್ಕರೆ ಕಾರ್ಖಾನೆಗಳಿಗೆ $\frac{1}{6}$ ಸೀಲಿಂಗ್ ಹಾಕುವುದು ಸಾಧುವಾಗಿದೆ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಿ ತಾವು 32 ನಿಮಿಷ ಮಾತನಾಡಿ ವಿವರವಾಗಿ ಹೇಳಿದ್ದು ಏನಿದೆ ಎನ್ನುವುದನ್ನು ತಿಳಿದುಕೊಳ್ಳುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ನಾನು ಅಶಕ್ತನಾಗಿದ್ದೇನೆ. ಸ್ವಾಮಿ ಈ $\frac{1}{6}$ ಎಂಬ ಪ್ರಮಾಣ ಎಂದು ಯಾವ ಆಧಾರದ ಮೇಲೆ ತೀರ್ಮಾನಕ್ಕೆ ಬಂದರು ? ಈ ಸಭೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಭೂಸುಧಾರಣೆಯ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಜತ್ತಿ ಕಮಿಟಿಯ ರಿಪೋರ್ಟ್ ಡ್ರಾಫ್ಟ್ ಬಿಲ್ಲು, ಸೆಲೆಕ್ಟ್ ಕಮಿಟಿ ವರದಿ ಚರ್ಚೆಗೆ ಬರುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಮುಂಚೆ ಈ ವಿಚಾರ ಗೊತ್ತಿರಲಿಲ್ಲವೇ ? ಏತಕ್ಕೋಸ್ಕರ ಈಗ ಕಡಿಮೆ ಮಾಡಿದ್ದಾರೆ ? ಅವರು ಸಭೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ವ್ಯಂಗವಾಗಿ ಉತ್ತರ ಹೇಳಿದ್ದನ್ನು ಯೋಚನೆ ಮಾಡಬೇಕಾಗಿದೆ. ಇಂಡಸ್ಟ್ರೀಸ್ ಪ್ರಾರಂಭಿಸುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಸರಿಯಾದ ಸೌಲಭ್ಯ ಒದಗಿಸಿಕೊಡಲು ಉದಾತ್ತ ಧೋರಣೆ ಇಟ್ಟುಕೊಳ್ಳಬೇಡವೆ ? ತಾವು ಅಧಿಕಾರಕ್ಕೆ ಬರುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಮುಂಚೆ ಮೈಸೂರು ಸಂಸ್ಥಾನದಲ್ಲಿ ಭೂಸುಧಾರಣೆ ಯೋಜನೆ ಇರಲಿಲ್ಲವೆ ? ಈ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಎಷ್ಟೆಷ್ಟು ವಿನಾಯಿತಿಕೊಡಬೇಕು ಎಂದು ಜತ್ತಿ ವರದಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಹೇಳಿದೆ ಮೊದಲಿನ ಪ್ರೊವೈಜೋ ಡಿಲೀಟ್ ಮಾಡಿ ಇನ್ನೊಂದು ಪ್ರೊವೈಜ್ ತರುವಾಗ್ಗೆ ನಿಜವಾಗಿಯೂ ರೈತರಿಗೆ ಆಗುವ ಕಷ್ಟಸುಖ ಏನು ಎಂಬುದು ನಿಮಗೆ ಮನವರಿಕೆಯಾಗಿದೆಯೋ ಎಂದು ನಾನು ಕೇಳುತ್ತೇನೆ.

ಈಗ ಮುಂದ್ರಭಾಗದಲ್ಲಿ ಆಗುತ್ತಿರುವ ಕಷ್ಟಸುಖಗಳನ್ನೂ ಕೇಳಿದ್ದೇವೆ. ಕಂಪ್ಲಿ ಕಾರ್ಖಾನೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಆಗುವ ಕಷ್ಟಸುಖಗಳನ್ನು ಕೇಳಿದ್ದೇವೆ. ಕಬ್ಬು ಬೆಳೆಯುವ ಪ್ರದೇಶದಿಂದ ಬಂದಿರುವ ಶ್ರೀಮಾನ್ ವೀರಣ್ಣಗೌಡರು ಹೇಳಿರುವುದನ್ನೂ ಕೇಳಿದ್ದೇವೆ. ಕಬ್ಬು ಬೆಳೆಯುವವರು ಕಬ್ಬನ್ನು ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಂಡು ಹೋಗಿ ಕಾರ್ಖಾನೆಯ ಹತ್ತಿರ ಹಾಕಿ, ಅದರ ಬೆಲೆಯನ್ನು ನಿಗದಿಮಾಡಬೇಕು ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಿದಾಗ, ತೀರ್ಮಾನ ಮಾಡಬೇಡಿ, ರೈತರಿಗೆ ತೊಂದರೆಯಾದರೂ ಆಗಲಿ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಿದ್ದೂ ಇದೆ. ಇದನ್ನೆಲ್ಲಾ ಏಕೆ ಹೇಳುತ್ತಿದ್ದೇನೆಂದರೆ, ವೈದ್ಯರಾದವರು ಕೊಡುವ ಔಷದಿಯಿಂದ ರೋಗ ವಾಸಿಯಾಗಲಿ, ಆಗದೆ ಇರಲಿ ಔಷಧಿಯನ್ನು ಚೆನ್ನಾಗಿ ಕೊಟ್ಟಿದ್ದೇನೆಂದರೆ ಅದನ್ನು ಒಪ್ಪಿಕೊಳ್ಳಬೇಕು ಎನ್ನುವಂತಿದೆ. ಈಗ ಸೂಚಿಸಿರುವಂತೆ ಸೀಲಿಂಗ್ ಹಾಕುವುದರಿಂದ ಸಕ್ಕರೆ ಕೈಗಾರಿಕೆಗೆ ಎಷ್ಟು ತೊಂದರೆಯಾಗುತ್ತದೆ ಎನ್ನುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಹೇಳುತ್ತಿದ್ದೇನೆ. ದೊಡ್ಡ ಕೈಗಾರಿಕೆಯನ್ನು ಇಟ್ಟು ಭಾರಿ ಯಂತ್ರಗಳನ್ನು ಇಟ್ಟುಕೊಂಡಿರುವ ಸಕ್ಕರೆ ಕಾರ್ಖಾನೆಗೆ ರೈತರು ತಾವು ಬೆಳೆದ ಕಬ್ಬನ್ನೂ ಕೊಡದೆ ಇದ್ದರೆ ಆ ಕಾರ್ಖಾನೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಕೆಲಸ ಮಾಡುವ ಕಾರ್ಮಿಕರ ಗತಿ ಏನು ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಲು 'ಕೊಂಕಣ ಸುತ್ತಿಕೊಂಡು ಮೈಲಾರಕ್ಕೆ ಬರುವಂತೆ' ನಾನು ಎಲ್ಲ ಸುತ್ತಿಕೊಂಡು ಬರುತ್ತಿದ್ದೇನೆ. ಮಾನ್ಯಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳು ಹೇಳುವುದರಲ್ಲಿ ನಮಗೆ ಏನೂ ಅರ್ಥ ಕಾಣುತ್ತ ಇಲ್ಲ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಕಡಿದಾಳ್ ಮಂಜಪ್ಪ.—ನಾವೆಲ್ಲ ಬಂಡವಾಳಗಾರರ ಹಿತವನ್ನು ರಕ್ಷಣೆ ಮಾಡುವವರು ನೀವು ಮಾತ್ರ ರೈತರ ಹಿತವನ್ನು ರಕ್ಷಣೆ ಮಾಡುವವರು !

ಶ್ರೀ ಸಿ. ಜೆ. ಮುಕ್ಕಣ್ಣಪ್ಪ.—ಈಗ ಎರಡು ಮೂರು ದಿನಗಳಿಂದ ಆದಂಥ ನಡುವಳಿಕೆಗಳನ್ನು ನೋಡಿದರೆ ನಿಮ್ಮ ಹೃದಯ ಎಷ್ಟು ವಿಶಾಲವಾಗಿದೆ ಎನ್ನುವುದು ಜನತೆಗೇ ಅರಿವಾಗಿದೆ. ಜಗಜ್ಜನಿತವಾಗಿದೆ. ನೀವು ಏನು ಮಾಡಲು ನಿಮಗೆ ಶಕ್ತಿ ಇಲ್ಲವೆಂಬುದನ್ನು ಅರ್ಥಮಾಡಿಕೊಂಡಿದ್ದೇನೆ. ಈಗ ಸ್ವಲ್ಪ ಉದಾರವಾಗಿ ಬಂದಿದ್ದೀರಿ. ಕಬ್ಬು ಬೆಳೆಯುವ ರೈತರಿಗೆ ಭೂಮಿ ಜಾಸ್ತಿ ಮಾಡೋಣ ಸಕ್ಕರೆ ಕಾರ್ಖಾನೆಗೆ ಮಿತಿ ಹಾಕೋಣ ಎಂದು ಈಗ ಹೇಳುತ್ತಿದ್ದೀರಿ. ಒಂದು ಕೈಯಲ್ಲಿ ಕೈಗಾರಿಕೆಯನ್ನು ಬೆಳೆಸಬೇಕು ಎಂದು ಹೇಳುತ್ತಾ ಮತ್ತೊಂದು ಕೈಯಲ್ಲಿ ಕುತ್ತಿಗೆಯನ್ನು ಹಿಸುಕುತ್ತಿದ್ದೀರಿ. ಗೌರಿಬಿದನೂರು, ಹಿರಿಯೂರು ಈ ಸ್ಥಳಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಸಕ್ಕರೆ ಕಾರ್ಖಾನೆ ಮಾಡಬೇಕೆಂದು ಹೇಳುತ್ತೀರಿ. ಗಂಗಾವತಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಇತ್ತೀಚೆಗೆ ಒಂದು ಕಾರ್ಖಾನೆ ಪ್ರಾರಂಭವಾಯಿತು. ಅದು ಖಾಸಗಿಯವರು ಇರತಕ್ಕುದು. ದೇಶದಲ್ಲಿ ಮೂರನೆಯ ಪಂಚವಾರ್ಷಿಕ ಯೋಜನೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಸಕ್ಕರೆ ಕಾರ್ಖಾನೆಗಳನ್ನು ತೆರೆಯಬೇಕು ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಿದಾಗ ನೀವು ಸೀಲಿಂಗ್ ಹಾಕುವುದನ್ನು ನೋಡಿದರೆ ನಮಗೆ ಈ ಕಷ್ಟಸುಖಗಳೇಕೆ ನಮಗೆ ಸಕ್ಕರೆ ಕಾರ್ಖಾನೆಯೇ ಬೇಡವೆಂದು ಹೇಳಬೇಕೆಂದು ಮನಸ್ಸಿನಲ್ಲಿ ವಿಚಾರ ಬರುತ್ತದೆ. ನಿಮಗೆ ಯಾವ ತಜ್ಞರು ಹೀಗೆ ಮಾಡಲು ಸಲಹೆ ಮಾಡಿದರು ಎನ್ನುವುದನ್ನು ಸ್ವಚ್ಛವಾದ ಅಚ್ಚ ಕನ್ನಡದಲ್ಲಿ ಹೇಳಿದ್ದರೆ ಅರ್ಥವಾಗುತ್ತಿತ್ತು. ಈಗ ಮಾನ್ಯ ಸದಸ್ಯರು ತಂದಿರುವ ತಿದ್ದುಪಡಿಯನ್ನು ಸಂಪೂರ್ಣವಾಗಿ ಒಪ್ಪಿಕೊಳ್ಳುವುದಕ್ಕಾಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಶ್ರೀಮಾನ್ ಶ್ರೀನಿವಾಸಶೆಟ್ಟರು ಸೂಚಿಸಿರುವಂತೆ "ಅರ್ಧಭಾಗ" ಎಂಬುದನ್ನು ಒಪ್ಪಿಕೊಳ್ಳಿ. ರೈತನಿಗೆ ಮತ್ತು ಕಾರ್ಖಾನೆಯವರಿಗೆ ಭಿನ್ನಾಭಿಪ್ರಾಯ ಬಂದರೆ, ರೈತರು ಕಬ್ಬು ಕೊಡದೆ ಹೋದರೆ, ಕಾರ್ಖಾನೆಗೆ ಸೇರಿದ ಜಮೀನಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಬೆಳೆಯುವ ಕಬ್ಬನ್ನು ಅರೆದು ತನ್ನ ಕೆಲಸಗಾರರಿಗೆ ಕೆಲಸವನ್ನೂ ಒದಗಿಸಿ ಕಾರ್ಖಾನೆ ನಡೆಯುವಂತೆ ಮಾಡಲು ಅವಕಾಶವಿರುತ್ತದೆ. ಆದುದರಿಂದ ಮಾನ್ಯಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳ ತಿದ್ದುಪಡಿಗೆ ಶ್ರೀಮಾನ್ ಶ್ರೀನಿವಾಸಶೆಟ್ಟರು ಸೂಚಿಸಿರುವ ತಿದ್ದುಪಡಿಯನ್ನು ಒಪ್ಪಿಕೊಳ್ಳಬೇಕೆಂದು ಕೇಳಿಕೊಳ್ಳುತ್ತೇನೆ.

†Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—There are two aspects with reference to this amendment. One is where the sugar factory is itself a landlord owning certain extent of land and getting the land cultivated for getting sugarcane required for the factory. Secondly there are certain factories which lease out land to tenants and obtain sugarcane from them. There is still another category where the ryots grow sugarcane with the prospect of getting them sold to sugar factories. I want to know to which categories this ceiling applies. Suppose a factory owns 500 acres of land and is getting the land cultivated for sugarcane through its own labour and investment, are you going to impose this restriction upon that category ? Suppose it has also engaged enants and leased some portion of its land to tenants for growings sugarcane, what should happen ? The other aspect is, why is Government interfering in this matter by fixing a ceiling ? What is the object ? Is it that the tenants are deprived of the opportunity of supplying sugarcane to the factory ? Is it the idea of the Government that the factories are taking away lands from the tenants ? These are some of the things which require explanation. Without reference to these if you fix the ceiling at one-sixth of the minimum required, it would adversely affect the sugar industry. Already there is a complaint that the sugar content of the sugarcane grown by the agriculturists is below normal and some of the factories are thinking of starting their own farms for growing sugarcane. The ideal state of affairs will be

(Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA)

where the factory can own the entire extent of land needed to feed it with sugarcane. You must visualise a case where there are 500 ryots supplying sugarcane to a factory like Mandya. Suppose they feel that the price that they get is not adequate and on that account they refuse to grow sugarcane what is to happen to the sugar factory? So I for one would altogether exempt the sugar factories from the operation of the ceiling. You must look at it from the point of view of an industry. It is not an individual, but it is a company. You have defined "person" so as to include a company also. Even a co-operative sugar factory will come under this definition. Suppose tomorrow a co-operative sugar factory comes into being and the Members of the factory own land in which sugarcane can be grown. Even then are you going to restrict their ceiling to one-sixth ? I for one would plead for their exemption from the ceiling clause and not fix the ceiling arbitrarily at one-sixth. The Hon'ble Minister has not convinced the House why it should be one-sixth and not one-fourth or any other fraction. In the case of Madras it is not fixed in an arbitrary manner, but the Sugar Factory Board will go into all aspects of the matter and then fix the ceiling.

1-00 P.M.

ಶ್ರೀ ಎಚ್. ಕೆ. ವೀರಣ್ಣಗೌಡ (ಲೋಕೋಪಯೋಗಿ ಹಾಗೂ ವಿದ್ಯುತ್ ಶಾಖೆಯ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳು).—ತಾವು ಅಪ್ಪಣೆ ಕೊಟ್ಟರೆ ನಾಲ್ಕು ಮಾತುಗಳನ್ನು ಹೇಳಬೇಕೆಂದಿದ್ದೇನೆ. ಶ್ರೀಮಾನ್ ಮಲ್ಲಾರಾಧ್ಯರು ಅನೇಕ ಸಂಶಯಗಳನ್ನು ವ್ಯಕ್ತಪಡಿಸಿದರೂ ರೈತರೆಲ್ಲಾ ಸೇರಿಕೊಂಡು ಸಕ್ಕರೆ ಕಂಪೆನಿಗೆ ಕಬ್ಬು ಕೊಡುವುದು ಎಂದರೆ ರೈತರ ಗತಿ ಏನಾಗುತ್ತದೆಂದು ಕೇಳಿದರು. ಅದು ಬರೀ ಊಹೆ. ಏಕೆಂದರೆ ಯಾವ ಕಾರ್ಖಾನೆಯೂ ತನಗೆ ಬೇಕಾದ ಕಬ್ಬನ್ನೆಲಾ ಬೆಳೆಯುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಸಾಧ್ಯವಿಲ್ಲ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಜೆ. ಬಿ. ಮಲ್ಲಾರಾಧ್ಯ.—ಆಲ್ಟರ್‌ನೇಟೀವಾಗಿ ಭತ್ತ ಬೆಳೆಯುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಷುರು ಮಾಡುತ್ತಾರೆ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಎಚ್. ಕೆ. ವೀರಣ್ಣಗೌಡ.—ಈಗ ನನಗೆ 30 ವರ್ಷದ ಅನುಭವ ಬಂದಿದೆ. ಎಷ್ಟೋ ಕಡೆ 9ರೂಪಾಯಿ ಇದ್ದಾಗಲೂ ಅವರು ಭತ್ತ ಬೆಳೆಯಲಿಲ್ಲ. ಒಂದು ಸಕ್ಕರೆ ಕಂಪೆನಿ ತನಗೆ ಬೇಕಾದ ಕಬ್ಬನ್ನೆಲ್ಲಾ ಬೆಳೆಯ ಬೇಕಾದರೆ 25 ಸಾವಿರ ಎಕರೆಯಾದರೂ ಬೇಕಾಗಬಹುದು ಈ 25 ಸಾವಿರ ಎಕರೆಯನ್ನು ಒಂದು ಕಂಪನಿಗಾಗಲಿ, ಅಥವ ಬಂಡವಾಳಗಾರರಿಗಾಗಲಿ ಕೋಆಪರೇಟೀವ್ ಸೊಸೈಟಿಗಾಗಲಿ, ಜಾಯಿಂಟ್ ಸ್ಟಾಕ್ ಕಂಪೆನಿಗಾಗಲಿ ಬಿಟ್ಟರೆ, 25 ಸಾವಿರ ಎಕರೆಯಿಂದ ಜೀವನ ಮಾಡತಕ್ಕಂಥ ಹತ್ತಾರು ಸಾವಿರ ರೈತರಿಗೆ ತೊಂದರೆಯಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಸಾಮಾನ್ಯವಾಗಿ ಯಾವ ಸಕ್ಕರೆ ಕಂಪೆನಿಗಳೂ ತಮಗೆ ಪೂರ್ತಿಯಾಗಿ ಬೇಕಾದ ಜಮೀನನ್ನು ಇಟ್ಟುಕೊಂಡಿಲ್ಲ, ಇಟ್ಟುಕೊಳ್ಳಲು ಸಾಧ್ಯವೂ ಇಲ್ಲ. ನಾನು 25 ವರ್ಷದಿಂದ ನಾನಾ ತರಹ ಚೇರ್ಮನ್ನಾಗಿ, ಡೈರೆಕ್ಟರಾಗಿ, ಮತ್ತು ಇತರ ಕೆಪ್ಯಾಸಿಟಿಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಅನುಭವ ಪಡೆದಿದ್ದೇನೆ. ಮಲ್ಲಾರಾಧ್ಯರು ವಿರೋಧಮಾಡಬೇಕೆಂಬ ಉದ್ದೇಶದಿಂದ ವಿರೋಧ ಮಾಡ ಬಹುದು. ಸಕ್ಕರೆ ಕಂಪೆನಿಗೆ ಸ್ವಲ್ಪ ಭಾಗದ ಜಮೀನು, ಎಂದರೆ, 500, ಸಾವಿರ ಎಕರೆಯೊಳಗಿರಬಹುದು, 4–5 ಸಾವಿರ ಎಕರೆ ಬೇಡ. ಕಾರಣ, ಬೀಜ ಕೊಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಹೊಸಹೊಸದಾಗಿ ಬೇರೆ ಬೇರೆ ತಳಿಯಿಂದ ಎಕ್ಸ್‌ಪೆರಿಮೆಂಟ್

ಮಾಡಿ ರೈತರಿಗೆ ಬೇಕಾದ ಸಹಾಯವನ್ನು ಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕಾಗಿ, ಸ್ವಲ್ಪ ಎಕರೆ ಭೂಮಿ ಅಗತ್ಯ. 20-35 ಸಾವಿರ ಎಕರೆ ಒಬ್ಬೊಬ್ಬರಿಗೆ, ಒಂದೊಂದು ಕೋ ಅಪರೇಟಿವ್ ಸೊಸೈಟೀಗೆ ಕೊಟ್ಟುಬಿಟ್ಟರೆ ಸುತ್ತ ಮುತ್ತ ಇರತಕ್ಕಂಥ ರೈತರಿಗೆ ಧಕ್ಕೆ ಆಗುತ್ತದೆ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಜೆ. ಬಿ. ಮಲ್ಲಾರಾಧ್ಯ.—25 ಸಾವಿರ ಎಕರೆ ಕೊಡಿ ಅಂತ ಯಾರು ಹೇಳಿದರು? Which sugar factory has got 25,000 acres? They are all hypothetical cases. The whole thing is misunderstood.

Sri KADIDAL MANJAPPA.—Item (*d*) of sub-clause (2) of clause 63 is: "land used as sugarcane farms operated by sugar factories." ಯಾವಾಗಲೂ ನಾನು ಹೇಳಿದು ಅರ್ಥವಾಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಅವರ ಪಾಯಿಂಟಿಗೆ ನಾನು ಬಂದರೆ ಅರ್ಥವಾಗುತ್ತದೆ, ಅವರ ಪಾಯಿಂಟಿಗೆ ನಾನು ಬರದಿದ್ದರೆ ಅರ್ಥವಾಗುವುದೇ ಇಲ್ಲ. ಶ್ರೀವಾರ್ ಮುಕ್ಕಣ್ಣಪ್ಪನವರು ಅಚ್ಚ ಕನ್ನಡದಲ್ಲಿ ಹೇಳಿಯೆಂದು ಹೇಳಿದರು ಅಚ್ಚಕನ್ನಡದಲ್ಲಿಯೇ ಹೇಳುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಅಪಾಯಿಂಟೆಡ್‌ಡೆ ಎಂದಿದೆ ಈಗ ಸಬ್‌ಕ್ಲಾಸ್ (2) (*d*) ಪ್ರಕಾರ ಈಗ ಯಾವ ಯಾವ ಫಾರಂಗಳು ಇವೆಯೋ, ಯಾವ ಯಾವ ಶುಗರ್ ಫ್ಯಾಕ್ಟರಿಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಎಷ್ಟೆಷ್ಟು ಜಮೀನು ಕಬ್ಬಿನ ಬೆಳೆಗಾಗಿ ಉಪಯೋಗಿಸುತ್ತಿದ್ದಾರೆಯೋ, ಅವುಗಳಿಗೆ ವಿನಾಯಿತಿ ತನ್ನಷ್ಟಕ್ಕೆ ತಾನೇ ದೊರೆಯುತ್ತದೆ ಇದು ಈಗಿರತಕ್ಕ ಫಾರ್ಮ್‌ಗಳಿಗೆ ಮುಂದೆ ಅವಶ್ಯಕವಿದ್ದಲ್ಲಿ ಒಂದನೇ ಆರು ಭಾಗವನ್ನು ಪೂರೈಸುವಷ್ಟು, ಕಬ್ಬನ್ನು ಪೂರೈಸುವಷ್ಟು ವಿಸ್ತಾರವಿದ್ದರೆ ಸಾಕು. ಏಕೆಂದರೆ ಈಗ ಸಾಮಾನ್ಯವಾಗಿ ಸಕ್ಕರೆ ಕಾರ್ಖಾನೆಯನ್ನು ಸ್ಥಾಪಿಸುವವರು ಕೆಲವು ಬಂಡವಾಳಗಾರರಿರಬಹುದು.

ಶ್ರೀ ಜೆ. ಬಿ. ಮಲ್ಲಾರಾಧ್ಯ.—ಯಾವ ಸಕ್ಕರೆ ಕಾರ್ಖಾನೆಗಳನ್ನು ಮನಸ್ಸಿನಲ್ಲಿಟ್ಟುಕೊಂಡಿರುತ್ತಾರೆ? ಒಂದೆರಡು ಉದಾಹರಣೆ ಕೊಡುತ್ತೀರ?

ಶ್ರೀ ಕಡಿದಾಳ್ ಮಂಜಪ್ಪ.—ಎಲ್ಲಾ ಸಕ್ಕರೆ ಫ್ಯಾಕ್ಟರಿಗಳನ್ನು ಗಮನದಲ್ಲಿಟ್ಟುಕೊಂಡಿದ್ದೇನೆ. ರೈತರಿಗೆ ಸಕ್ಕರೆ ಕಾರ್ಖಾನೆಗಳಿಂದ ಪ್ರಯೋಜನ ಲಭಿಸಬೇಕಾದರೆ ಅವರು ಕಬ್ಬನ್ನು ಸಕ್ಕರೆ ಕಾರ್ಖಾನೆಗೆ ಒದಗಿಸತಕ್ಕ ಅವಕಾಶವಿರಬೇಕು. ಎಲ್ಲಾ ಕಬ್ಬೂ ಕಾರ್ಖಾನೆಯ ಫಾರ್ಮಿನಿಂದ ಬರುವುದಾದರೆ, ರೈತರಿಗೆ ಕಾರ್ಖಾನೆಗಳಿಂದ ಏನೂ ಪ್ರಯೋಜನವಾಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ ಸುಖವಾಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ರೈತರ ಹಿತದೃಷ್ಟಿಯಿಂದ ಇದು ಬಹಳ ಅವಶ್ಯಕ. ರೈತರ ಹಿತದೃಷ್ಟಿಯಿಂದ ಈ ತಿದ್ದುಪಡಿಯನ್ನು ತಂದಿದ್ದಾಗಿದೆ.

Mr. SPEAKER.— I will put to vote the amendment to amendment moved by Sri V. Srinivasa Shetty. The question is:

> "That in the proposed proviso for the words 'one sixth' the word half' shall be substituted."

The amendment was negatived.

Mr. SPEAKER.— Now I will put the admendment of the Minister. The question is:

> "That for the two provisos in clause 64, the following proviso be substituted:—
>
> "Provided that in respect of land required for growing sugar can eby a sugar factory, the ceiling limit permissible under this section shall be one-sixth of the minimum area of the land which in the opinion of the State Government, is required to feed the said factory."

The amendment was adopted.

MR. SPEAKER.— Amendment No. 157.

Sri G. N. PUTTANNA. — Sir, I move :

"That the following proviso shall be added at the end of the first proviso:—

provided further that nothing in this section shall apply to acquisition or coming into possession of any land, when the total of Members of a joint family increases and subject to the provisions of section. 63."

MR. SPEAKER.— Amendment moved:

"That the following proviso shall be added at the end of the first proviso:—

provided further that nothing in this section shall apply to acquisition or coming into possession of any land, when the total number of Members of a joint family increases and subject to the provisions of section. 63."

†ಶ್ರೀ ಜಿ. ಎನ್. ಪುಟ್ಟಣ್ಣ.—ಇದರಲ್ಲಿ ಹೆಚ್ಚಿಗೆ ಏನೂ ಹೇಳಬೇಕಾಗಿಲ್ಲ. ಸೆಕ್ಷನ್ 64ರ ಪ್ರಕಾರ transfer gift, purchase, exchange, mortgage, lease surrender ಮಾಡಬೇಕೆಂದಿದ್ದರೆ, ಇದೊಂದೂ ಅಪ್ಲೈ ಆಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲವೆಂದು ಹೇಳಿದ್ದೀರಿ. ಒಂದು ವೇಳೆ ಮೂರು ಜನ ಅಣ್ಣ ತಮ್ಮಂದಿರು ಇದ್ದರೆ ಒಬ್ಬನಿಗೆ 8 ಜನ ಮಕ್ಕಳಿದ್ದರೆ, ನಿಮ್ಮ ಅಪಾಯಿಂಟೆಡ್ ಡೆ ಇದ್ದರೆ ಸೀಲಿಂಗ್ ಫಿಕ್ಸ್ ಆಗಿರುತ್ತದೆ. ಅದರಲ್ಲಿ ಒಬ್ಬನಿಗೆ ಮಕ್ಕಳಿರುವುದಿಲ್ಲ ಅವನಿಗೆ ಮಕ್ಕಳಾದರೆ, ಸೇವಿಂಗ್ ಲಿಮಿಟೆಡ್ನಿಂದ far below ಬರುತ್ತದೆ. ಈ ಕೇಸು ಬಿಟ್ಟು ಗಿಫ್ಟ್ ಕೊಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಅಪ್ಲೈ ಆಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲವೆನ್ನುವುದು ಯಾವ ದರ್ಮ? ಇಬ್ಬರು ಅಣ್ಣ ತಮ್ಮಂದಿರಿರುತ್ತಾರೆ; ಅವರಿಗೆ ಹೆಂಡತಿಯರಿರುತ್ತಾರೆ, ಒಂದು ಸೀಲಿಂಗ್ ಕೊಟ್ಟು ಬಿಡುತ್ತಾರೆ. ಒಬ್ಬರಿಗೆ ಒಂದು ಮಗು ಇರುತ್ತದೆ. 5 ಜನರು ಇರುತ್ತಾರೆ, 27 ಸ್ಟಾಂಡರ್ಡ್ ಎಕರೆ ಒಂದು ಸೀಲಿಂಗ್ ಕೊಟ್ಟಿರುತ್ತೀರ. ಈ ಇಬ್ಬರು ಹೆಂಡಿರಲ್ಲಿ ಇಬ್ಬರೂ ಗರ್ಭಿಣಿಯರಾಗಿರುತ್ತಾರೆ ನಿಮ್ಮ ಅಪಾಯಿಂಟೆಡ್ ಡೇಯ 15 ದಿವಸದೊಳಗೆ ಇಬ್ಬರಿಗೂ ಮಕ್ಕಳಾಗಿ ಇಬ್ಬರು ಜಾಸ್ತಿಯಾಗುತ್ತಾರೆ, ಅವರಿಗೆ ಏನೂ ಪ್ರಾವಿಶನ್ ಮಾಡಿಲ್ಲ. 64ರ ಪ್ರಕಾರ ಒಂದು ಉದಾಹರಣೆಯನ್ನು ಹೇಳುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಇಬ್ಬರು ಅಣ್ಣ ತಮ್ಮಂದಿರು ಇರುತ್ತಾರೆನ್ನೋಣ. ಅವರ ಹೆಂಡತಿಗಳಾಗಿರುವವರು ಈ ಶಾಸನ ಬರುವ ವೇಳೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಗರ್ಭವತಿಯಾಗಿರುತ್ತಾರೆ. ಹಿಂದೂ ಕಾನೂನಿನ ಪ್ರಕಾರ ಗರ್ಭಿಣಿಯಾಗಿರುವ ಕೂಸಿಗೂ ಆಸ್ತಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಹಕ್ಕು ಬರುತ್ತದೆ ಎಂದಿದೆ. ತಾವು ಈ ಬಿಲ್ಲಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಹೇಳಿರುವಂತೆ ಐದು ಜನರಿಂದ ಕೂಡಿರುವ ಒಂದು ಸಂಸಾರಕ್ಕೆ 18 ಎಕರೆಗಳಷ್ಟೋ ಅಥವಾ 27 ಎಕರೆಗಳಷ್ಟೋ ಎಂದು ಒಂದು ರೀತಿಯಾದ ಸೀಲಿಂಗಿನ ಪರಿಮಿತಿಯನ್ನು ಹಾಕಿರುತ್ತೀರಿ. ಆದರೆ ಈ ಶಾಸನ ಬರುವಾಗ ಎಂದರೆ "On the appointed day" ಈ ಮೇಲೆ ಹೇಳಿದ ಸಂಸಾರಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಹೆಚ್ಚಿನ ಜನಗಳು ಸಂಸಾರಕ್ಕೆ ಸೇರಿದರೆ ಅವರಿಗೆ ಭೂಮಿಯನ್ನು ಕೊಡಲು ಇದರಲ್ಲಿ ಅವಕಾಶವಿಲ್ಲ. ಮೊದಲೇ ಸರೆಂಡರು ಮಾಡಿರುತ್ತಾರೆ. ಆದ್ದರಿಂದ ಭೂಮಿ ಇರುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಆಗೇನು ಮಾಡಬೇಕು ಎನ್ನುವುದನ್ನು ವಿಷದ ಪಡಿಸುವುದಕ್ಕಾಗಿ ಈ ರೀತಿಯಾಗಿರುವ ಒಂದು ಪ್ರಾವಿಷನ್ನನ್ನು ಇಟ್ಟು ಒಂದು ತಿದ್ದುಪಡಿಯನ್ನು ತಂದಿದ್ದೇನೆ. ಇದನ್ನು ಮಾನ್ಯ ರೆವೆನ್ಯೂ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳು ಒಪ್ಪಿಕೊಳ್ಳಬೇಕೆಂದು ಕೋರುತ್ತಿದ್ದೇನೆ. ಇದರಿಂದ ಇನ್ನೊಂದು ತೊಂದರೆ ಏನಾಗುತ್ತದೆ ಎಂದರೆ ರೈತನಾಗಿರುವವನು ದಿನ ಬೆಳಗ್ಗೆ ಕೋರ್ಟುಗಳ ವ್ಯಾಜ್ಯಕ್ಕೆ ತುತ್ತಾಗಬೇಕಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. Unnecessary litigations ಗಳಿಗೆ ಕಾರಣಗಳಾಗುತ್ತವೆ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಕಡಿದಾಳ್ ಮಂಜಪ್ಪ.—ತಮ್ಮ ತಿದ್ದುಪಡಿಯನ್ನು ಇದರಲ್ಲೇ ಸೇರಿಸುವುದಕ್ಕಾಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ತಾವು ಸೆಕ್ಷನ್ನು 63 ರಲ್ಲಿರುವ ಮೊದಲನೇ ಕ್ಲಾಜಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಒದಿ ನೋಡಿ ಅದು ಹೀಗಿದೆ

"Provided that where the member or members of the family of such person or of the joint family of which such person is a member exceeds five, he or the joint family as the case may be, may hold six additional standard acres for each member in excess of five so, however as not to exceed twice the ceiling area in the aggregate."...

ಹೀಗೆ ಜಾಯಿಂಟ್ಸ್ ಫ್ಯಾಮಿಲಿಯೊಳಗೆ ಐದು ಜನಕ್ಕಿಂತ ಜಾಸ್ತಿಯಾಗಿದ್ದರೆ ಅವರಿಗೆ ಆರು ಎಕರೆಗಳಷ್ಟು ಹೆಚ್ಚಿಗೆ ಬರುತ್ತದೆ. ಆದಕಾರಣ ತಮ್ಮ ತಿದ್ದುಪಡಿ ಇಲ್ಲಿಗೆ ಸರಿ ಹೊಂದುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಇದನ್ನು ಒಪ್ಪಲು ಸಾಧ್ಯವಿಲ್ಲ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಜಿ. ಎನ್. ಪುಟ್ಟಣ್ಣ.—ತಾವು ಇದನ್ನು ಏಕೆ ಒಪ್ಪುವುದಿಲ್ಲ ಎನ್ನುವುದು ಗೊತ್ತಾಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಜಾಯಿಂಟು ಹಿಂದೂ ಲಾದಲ್ಲಿರುವಂತೆ ಇಲ್ಲಿಯೂ ಅನ್ವಯವಾಗುತ್ತದೆ ಎಂದು ಇದರಲ್ಲೇಕೆ ಸೇರಿಸಬಾರದು? ಮಕ್ಕಳು ಈ ಶಾಸನ ಜಾರಿಗೆ ತರುವ ಕಾಲದಲ್ಲಿ ಹುಟ್ಟದೆ ಕೆಲವು ಕಾಲದಮೇಲೆ ಹುಟ್ಟಿದರೆ ಅಂತಹ ಮಕ್ಕಳಿಗೆ ಇಲ್ಲಿ ಭೂಮಿ ಹೇಗೆ ಸಿಗುತ್ತದೆ? ಇದನ್ನು ವಿವರವಾಗಿ ಇದರಲ್ಲಿ ಸೇರಿಸಬೇಕು.

"Subject to the conditions and provisions contained in the Hindu Law or Civil Law"

ಎಂದು ಸೇರಿಸಿ ಇದರಲ್ಲೇನು ತೊಂದರೆಯಾಗುತ್ತದೆ?

Sri KADIDAL MANJAPPA.—There is no need for the amendment. It is provided in the proviso to section 63.

Mr. SPEAKER.—There is an amendment to clause 63, standing in the name of Sri V. Srinivasa Shetty.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Clause 63. There are amendments in the name of Sri Basave Gowda and others.

Sri A. M. BASAVE GOWDA (Chickmagalur).— Sir, I beg to move.

"In the proposed sub-clause (2) the words 'other than a person holding land cultivated by plantation crops' shall be deleted."

Mr. SPEAKER.—Amendment moved:

"In the proposed sub-clause (2) the words "other than a person holding land cultivated by plantation crops" shall be deleted."

Sri M. C. NARASIMHAN (K. G. F.).—I beg to move:

"That in the proposed clause.—

(1) In the proviso to sub-clause (1) for the words 'may hold six additional' the words 'may hold five additional' shall be substituted"

(2) Sub-clause (2) shall be deleted.

(3) Sub-clause (3) shall be deleted.

(4) Sub-clause (5) shall be deleted.

(Sri M. C. NARASIMHAN)

(5) A new sub-clause shall be added at the end of proposed clause:—

"If as a result of irrigation from a source constructed by Government any land held by a person after the appointed day is converted into any class of land mentioned in Schedule I Part A, and there by the holding of the person exceeds the ceiling area, the land so in excess shall be deemed to be surplus land and accordingly the provisions of this Act shall apply to the holding."

6. In the proposed sub-clause (6) of Clause 63 the following Explanation shall be added:—

"Exempted land shall mean land exempted under Section 63 (5).'

Mr. SPEAKER.—Sri M. C. Narasimhan amendment moved.

Sri V. SRINIVASA SHETTY (Coondapur).—Sir, I move:

"That in the proposed item (*d*) of sub-clause (5) the word 'reasonably' shall be deleted and the word 'contiguous" shall be added after the word 'compact'.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Amendment moved:

"That in the proposed item (*d*) of sub-clause (5) the word 'reasonably' shall be deleted and the word 'contiguous' shall be added after the word 'compact'"

†ಶ್ರೀ ಎ. ಎಂ. ಬಸವೇಗೌಡ.—ಮೊದಲಿನಿಂದಲೂ ಮೂಲ ಬಿಲ್ಲಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಪ್ಲಾಂಟೇಷನ್ ಕ್ರಾಪ್ಸ್‌ಗೆ ಎಗ್ಸೆಂಪ್ಷನ್ ಇದೆ. ಸೆಲೆಕ್ಟ್ ಕಮಿಟಿಯಲ್ಲೂ ಹಾಗೆಯೇ ಇತ್ತು. ಈಗ 8 ಸ್ಟಾಂಡರ್ಡ್ ಎಕರೆಗಳು ಪ್ಲಾಂಟೇಷನ್ ಕ್ರಾಪ್ಸ್‌ನಲ್ಲಿ ವಿನಾಯಿತಿ ಇರಬೇಕೆಂಬುದಾಗಿ ತಿದ್ದುಪಡಿ ಬೇರೆ ಇದೆ. ಇದನ್ನು ಸರಿಯಾಗಿ ಕ್ಲಾರಿಫೈ ಮಾಡಬೇಕು. ಇವತ್ತಿಗೆ ಸಣ್ಣ ಸಣ್ಣ ಹೋಲ್ಡರ್ಸ್‌ಗೆ ಫ್ಯೂಚರ್ ಅಕ್ವಿಸಿಷನ್ನಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಹೆಚ್ಚಿಗೆ ಸ್ಟಾಂಡರ್ಡ್ ಎಕರೆಗಳಿರಬೇಕೆಂದು ಬೇರೆ ಹೇಳುತ್ತೀರಿ. ಇದನ್ನೂ ಸಹ ನೀವು ಕ್ಲಾರಿಫೈ ಮಾಡಬೇಕೆಂದು ಹೇಳುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಒಟ್ಟಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಪ್ಲಾಂಟೇಷನ್ ಕ್ರಾಪ್ಸ್ ಇಟ್ಟುಕೊಂಡಿರುವವರಿಗೂ ಕೂಡ ಸೀಲಿಂಗ್ 27 ಸ್ಟಾಂಡರ್ಡ್ ಎಕರೆಗಳಿರಬೇಕು ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಿರುವಾಗ, ಫ್ಯೂಚರ್ ಅಕ್ವಿಸಿಷನ್ ಮಾಡಿಕೊಂಡವರಿಗೆ ಎಷ್ಟು ಎಕರೆಗಳಿರಬೇಕೆಂಬುದು ಈ ತಿದ್ದುಪಡಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಕ್ಲಿಯರಾಗಿಲ್ಲ. ಪ್ಲಾಂಟೇಷನ್ ಕ್ರಾಪ್ಸಿಗೂ ಸಂಬಂಧಪಟ್ಟ ಸ್ಟಾಂಡರ್ಡ್ ಎಕರೆಗಳು ಇಷ್ಟೇ ಎಂಬುದಾಗಿ ನಿಗದಿಯಾಗಿರಬೇಕು. ಅದು ಇಲ್ಲಿ ಸರಿಯಾಗಿ ತಿಳಿಸಿಲ್ಲ. ಆದ್ದರಿಂದ ಫ್ಯೂಚರ್ ಅಕ್ವಿಸಿಷನ್ನಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಈ ಸೀಲಿಂಗ್ ವಿನಾಯಿತಿ ಬಗ್ಗೆ 18 ಸ್ಟಾಂಡರ್ಡ್ ಎಕರೆಗಳು ಇರಬೇಕೆಂದು ನನ್ನ ತಿದ್ದುಪಡಿ.

†Sri V. SRINIVASA SHETTY.—Sir, my amendment is very simple. In Clause 63 as amended in (*d*):

"Land utilised by an efficiently managed farm which consist of a reasonably compact area on which heavy investment or permanent structural improvements have been made and whose break up in the opinion of the Tribunal is likely to lead to a fall in production".

Sir, this leaves plant to the tribunal to liberalise the interpretation of an efficiently managed farm. Why should there be these words 'reasonably compact' ? A compact farm is a Government Farm. Sir, this word 'reasonable' seems to be 'unreasonable'. By the omission of the word 'reasonable', the definition would be more reasonable. So, that word is out of place. We had proned in the Select Committee a lot from the original definition but still some words give latitude to have a number of independent farms. A person may have one farm in a place and another farm within one or two miles and the court may uphold his contention that it is efficiently managed. My suggestion is, let him have one thousand acres, but it should be in one contiguous area and it should be one farm. Therefore, I have moved this amendment. I hope that the Hon'ble Minister will see the reasonableness of it and accept it.

My friend Sri. Narasimhan has moved an amendment that for each individual instead of six it may be five standard acres. Even with that, I am afraid, nobody is going to be hit. A few acres might be left for distribution to the so called poor people and landless. It is a reasonable amendment and I hope the Hon'ble Minister is in full agreement with the spirit of the amendment.

Another argument seems to be that if a land is of a lower category and is converted into a higher category due to irrigation facilities set up by Government, then the excess surplus area should be taken away by the Government. That seems to be very reasonable because the area in the Bill is phenominal. If it is practically calculated, some friends say that nothing would be left for distribution in certain areas. At present, certain lands may not be of very high value but, Government have set a pattern of extending irrigation facilities. The family will divide and sub-divide itself and get 800 acres and if all these 800 acres would be converted into first class wet lands when irrigation facilities are given to these lands, there is nothing to show as to what should happen to this extend of land.

Sri KADIDAL MANJAPPA.—Under clause 75, Ceiling will apply in such cases. But, in cases where the owner, by his own efforts, converts one class of land into a higher class of land by sinking irrigation well or by installing an irrigation pump, etc., he will not be compelled to surrender the excess area. In other cases, ceiling will apply.

Sri V. SRINIVASA SHETTY.—But, that clause is not specific. It says, under two circumstances, he need not surrender the land. Why not we clearly say it ? We should not leave it to the courts to interpret. So, I request the Hon'ble Minister to accept this amendment.

Sri M. C. NARASIMHAN.—Sir, this is rather a very important clause and so sufficient attention should be bestowed and we must see if the particular amendment proposed by the Hon'ble Minister will subserve the idea with which ceiling is brought in the State. Here, the first

(Sri M. C. NARASIMHAN)

portion of the amendment is to the effect that the ceiling area must be 27 standard acres as against the proposed ceiling area of 18 for future acquisition. In respect of land held on the appointed day or held prior to the appointed day, it should be 27 standard acres. Sir, I am unable to understand the reason why there should be such an invidious distinction made between people who own land on a particular date and those who happen to get land subsequent to the appointed date. This distinction is really opposed to the very object mentioned in the first paragraph of the Bill namely, enacting a uniform law. The uniformity should not only be in the point of area but also in time. Sir , you can very well see that such a distinction is not made in any other ceiling law which has been brought in any other neighbouring State. The Planning Commission said that it should be 18 standard acres but we say that 18 acres ceiling will be for future acquisition. This seems to satisfy the consciousness of the Congress Party. Sir, in the Madras Legislation or Maharastra legislation ceiling Act there is no such distinction. Sir, even in the ceiling legislation passed by Parliament in respect of Delhi and some of the administrative areas, they do not make any such distinction. Instead of this, you can exempt all persons who hold lands on appointed day; that would be true and honest.

Sir, the first day the Revenue Minister was so eloquent about the number of persons who come within the ambit of legislation. He said some 63 lakhs.

Sri KADIDAL MANJAPPA.—I said 30 lakhs of acres are going to be registered in the name of tenants after this legislation is implemented and I said two lakhs of acres of surplus land may be available.

Sri M. C. NARASIMHAN.—Sir, I do not think that even God can say with certainty in this State that it will be 2 lakhs of acres.

Sri KADIDAL MANJAPPA.—Do you believe in God ?

Sri M. C. NARASIMHAN.—Whatever faith I may have, you must be true to your God. It is impossible to say whether 2 lakhs of acres would be available. In Telengana and Gulbarge, hardly 4,500 acres were available when the Hyderabad Act was introeduced. I do not think you can do better. Certain safeguards I can understand after 10th May 1957—you find in all legislations. The Maharashtra Act says, after 10th September 1959—they say, no partition after that date which is sought to be done "with a view to defeat the provisions of this Act." If some such principle was there, we could have trusted the *bona fides* of the Revenue Minister. He is very sensitive. He is supposed to represent the tenant class. I understand from Sri Muckannappa that he is always anxious to safeguard the interests of the tenants. What I am submitting is, in the absence of such safeguards, since 10th September 1957 since the Jatti report came into publication—since that day the dea of

ceiling is mooted. As a result of that, is it not fair that such a clause should be incorporated here ? Even in the absence of such a clause, you want 27 standard acres. I feel this is an invidious distinction. It is as vague as saying that all these people belonging to the Congress Party shall get 27 standard acres and all the rest of the people shall get 18 standard acres. That is so far as the ceiling is concerned. Even here, I understand that the Revenue Minister was reluctant that it should be 27 standard acres in respect of holdings before the appointed day. If that is the true position, at least he would have had kind friends in the Congress Party who are anxious to have the ceiling enlarged as much as possible. Instead of saying 'lands in excess of the ceiling area namely 27 standard acres' he should have said 'each member of the family should be five or even four. That is one way of seeing that the total land is increased, or the total area that comes within the operation of exemptions would be minimised without being unfair to anybody. At least this could have been done. Why not say families of more than five persons—family has been defined in a wonderful manner so as to include grand-children. Why not say for families in excess of five-it should be five standard acres or 4 standard acres. I have brought this amendment to say that. By rejecting this amendment the Minister is making his position as unreasonable as possible. What is what I want to say. The point is, in all these places, the division is effected in such a way that if it is a multiple of 5. For example Madras says, 30 standard acres and each member of the family can get not more than 6. Likewise, Maharashtra says still less—so the multiple will be actually less than the ceiling limit. Here if you take 6 standard acres, 6×5, it will be 30. The ceiling is 27 for the fifth member of the family, it will be a fraction of a holding. Instead of that, if it is made 5×5, it will be less than 27 standard acres. Even for a family, I can understand in Kerala such a thing being brought in. Why it should be brought in here, where the rate of growth of population is small, comparatively small. Why it should be made 6 standard acres, I cannot understand at all. Why it should be in terms of family holding and why it should not be the multiple of an acre ? After all, it has some relationship with the population, is what I understand from looking into the various laws in force in Madras and Kerala. Here that is not the position. The average size of the family it much smaller if you look to the census figures. Even from that point of view, there is no justification for saying that each member of the family in excess should get 6 standard acres and that too, family being defined in such a wider fashion. Nowhere is it said that the definition of the family includes grand-children.

Another aspect of the matter is, I suggested that clause 2 should be deleted, so that 18 standard acres should be the uniform pattern of ceiling area. It will be in accordance with the Planning Commission's directive. If you are sincere about it, we should have 18 standard acres. Even the Revenue Minister knows that the ceiling is too much

(Sri M. C. NARASIMHAN)

and nobody will come within the ambit of ceiling limit in view of the partitions that have taken place. It will not be lower than what is prescribed in the Maharashtra State, which prescribes 18 standard acres. What we consider standard acre is first-class land. Supposing States Reorganisation had not taken place and our Maharashtrian friends continued there, they would have to be satisfied with 18 standard acres. In Madras, it is still under discussion.

While on sub-clause (2), I would like to endorse and support the suggestion made by Sri Basave Gowda in section 104, while dealing with the ceiling limit in respect of coffee, rubber and tea-plantations. We see nothing contained in section 63 or 64 which apply to plantations. In the amendment to section 104 there is a reference by the Minister (6th list) : It reads like this :

> "The provisions 63 and 64 shall not apply to regimental farm lands or to plantations."

What is the point in mentioning this when you say in the subsequent section 'nothing contained in 63 and 64 shall apply'. There is no point in this particular portion referred by my friend Sri Basave Gowda for which he has given an amendment that it should be deleted. Even if the Minister is convinced that it should be retained, if he is not inclined to accept the amendment, nothing is lost. Definitely it has reference only to this particular aspect referred to by my friend. For that reason I do not see how it is necessary to keep these two words to which amendment has been given by Mr. Basave Gowda.

Then coming to sub-clause (3), the Minister's proposed amendment is to the effect that on the appointed day, if there is any forest land or grazing land, such land shall not be taken into account for purposes of ceiling. Now Sir, I have carefully examined this matter. I know what reasons would be advanced. I have given an amendment saying that it should be deleted. This obviously has reference only to the holdings on the appointed day. What I am saying is that this applies to the lands whose holdings come within the purview of 63 (1), that is 27 standard acres in respect of holdings on the appointed day. Taking into account that these 27 standard acres which is very wide, I do not see any justification for including forest lands in this,—for not taking into account forest land or land exclusively meant for grazing cattle, etc. Sir, I have looked into similar provisions elsewhere.

Sri B. K. PUTTARAMAIYA (Channapatna).—When the Chair is sleeping how is a Member entitled to speak on the floor Sir ?

Mr. SPEAKER.—The presumption is wrong.

Sri M. RAMAPPA.—Is napping prohibited Sir ?

Mr. SPEAKER.—Snoring is prohibited. What applies to the Members applies to the Chair also.

Sri M. C. NARASIMHAN.—I have looked carefully through the Maharashtra ceiling Act which has received the President's assent. There is no such provision in the Maharashtra Act. They do not say forest land and lands used for grazing cattle shall not be computed for purposes of ceiling area.

Sri KADIDAL MANJAPPA.—In Kerala, private forests are exempted.

Sri M. C. NARASIMHAN.—There the situation is entirely different. Topography is different.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—Is it the suggestion of the Hon'ble Minister for Revenue that these forest lands and grazing lands is included within the holding of agricultural land ?

Sri KADIDAL MANJAPPA.—While computing ceiling area, these lands will be excluded.

Sri G. VENKATAI GOWDA.—Is it not a fact that the Central Land Reforms Committee has said that these should not be excluded]?

Sri M. C. NARASIMHAN.—Sir, in Kerala conditions are different. Large forests are in private hands and they are not interspersed with agricultural lands. In Mysore we have forests owned exclusively by the State and very small areas may be there which are attached as agricultural lands. The entire topography is different between Mysore and Kerala. There is no question of nationalised forest in Kerala. Further the ceiling in Kerala is low, 15 acres generally and in the case of unmarried women it is only 5 acres.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—That is why Mr. Narashiman got married early (*Laughter*).

Sri M. C. NARASIMHAN.—In fact I have not been wise. If I had known this I would have been wiser.

The original Bill did not say anything about future acquisitions. Supposing it had been based on annual income, then it would be very difficult to compute the annual income of forests or grazing land. Supposing the whole basis had been on the annual income, then this would not have come in the way unless we say by a legal fiction that forests of certain acres would be deemed to yield this and that income annually. I expected Hon'ble Revenue Minister to say why this distinction should be envisaged for purpose of computing ceiling. I am definitely of the view that there is no necessity for including this area for the purpose of computing the ceiling limit. The only saving clause is if that land is not being used as forest land or land is not being used for growing grass, then it may be taken into account and the normal law will operate.

There is another difficulty. Supposing the forest land or land reserved for growing of, grass, etc., is converted into wet land or is converted into regular agricultural land capable of growing agricultural crops, what would happen to the ceiling. Will the ceiling be 18 or 27 acres

(Sri M. C. NARASIMHAN)

This is a land holding, for which 27 acres would apply and hereafter converted into agr icultural land capable of growing crops. The difficulty will arise as to whether it should be 27 or 18 acres ceiling. To avoid all this confusion we can delete it and take forest land or grass land for the purpose of computing ceiling limit.

Sir, I submit nothing is lost. The proviso it self assumes here that such forest land or corresponding land can be converted at a later date into land on which crops can be grown. I can understand if the land is barren and cannot be converted at all. We have not stated that. If it applies to forest land and grazing land, then it should apply to other categories of land which are lying fallow for years together. Why should a richer land on which grass can be grown or forests are there, be exempted. I do not see any logic in it and it is a distinction which does not bear even a moment's scrutiny.

So far as the next clause is concerned, sub-clause 4 is besides the point. This is taken care of in clause 104 where we exclude plantations.

So far as the proposed clause 5 is concerned, I have said that it should be deleted· This is a clause which seeks to expect orchards and efficiently managed farms and sugarcane farms operated by sugarcane factories. That is in respect of the existing holding. Once again this will not apply to future. Hereafter orchards coming into being or efficiently managed farms coming into being, will not come within the purview of the ceiling area of 18 acres. That is how I understand it. If the idea is that orchards and efficiently managed farms should be exempted on principle from the operation of ceiling, then there must be a distinction between orchards on the existing date and orchards coming into being on a future date. Or we should say that orchards and other things enumerated here would come within the ambit of ceiling.

Twenty-seven standard acres is very wide. I wonder if there are any orchards in the State having more than 27 standard acres. That is why I have said in my amendment that the proviso should be deleted. I could have understood if Government had said that all lands vesting in the Bhoodan Yagna Committee would be exempted. I do not know if they are followers of Vinoba Bhave, but there is no exemption to Bhoodan lands. Only orchards and a few other things are exempted on the appointed day. It is very difficult to define efficiently managed farms. In the whole State I do not think there are this category of farms which can be put down as efficiently managed. The definition as it stands cuts both ways. There may be a genuine case of a farm which can come within the exemption limit but because it is said to be not efficiently managed it cannot come within the exemption limit. There may be another farm which does not deserve to be called an

efficiently managed farm, but for political reasons it is called an efficiently managed farm and brought within the ambit of the exemption limit because there are no norms laid down in the statute to define an efficiently managed farm.

Then I find that a new sub-clause (6) has been proposed. This was not there in the report of the Select Committee. This seems to be a product of the deliberations of the Congress Legislature Party. The Revenue Minister owed it to this House to explain why this was brought in. The House must be treated with sufficient consideration.

Sri KADIDAL MANJAPPA.—The Hon'ble Member himself suggested that in the case of these two categories of lands which are to be exempted the ceiling limit should be imposed. I distinctly remember that at the first stage the Hon'ble Member asked me whether irrespective of the extent of lands mentioned as orchards anybody will be able to have one more ceiling area.

Sri M. C. NARASIMHAN.—My point is that the Revenue Minister owed it to this House to explain why this amendment has been brought in because this is a new amendment.

Sri KADIDAL MANJAPPA.—I distinctly remember that Sri Narasimhan found with me on the plea that in addition to the exempted lands a person will be able to have one more ceiling area irrespec tive of the extent of exempted lands and now he turns round and says that I owe an explanation to the House.

Sri C. J. MUCKANNAPPA.—Let a copy of the proceeding be produced. Let him not quote from vague memory.

Sri KADIDAL MANJAPPA.—My memory is sharp.

Sri M. C. NARASIMHAN.—Sir, I said as a general proposition. After all, sub-clause 6 and sub-clause 7 is a new clause which is added.

Sri KADIDAL MANJAPPA.—I never knew that this was the tactics ; I will be guarded hereafter. (*laughter*).

Sri M. C. NARASIMHAN.—Anyway, I have given the amendment to the effect that the exemption shall include such land as is referred to in section 63 (1). Again the other defect is :

"the area of the exempted land is less than the ceiling area......"

What is the ceiling area ? Ceiling area is defined differental for different purposes. It should be only 18 standard acres and not 27. If the exempted land is less than the ceiling area, a person is entitled to hold the other land equal to the ceiling area. According to definition (2), it is only 18 standard acres. At the last moment, I may turn round and say, it is 27 standard acres. Supposing there is a person holding 14 acres on the appointed day and 30 or 40 acres of orchards and some other land. Will he be entitled to get 27 standard acres for the purpose of determining ceiling or 18 standard acres ? Reasonably, it should be 18 standard acres. That should be clarified.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—Will the Hon'ble Minister at least say what it is at least at this stage ?

Sri KADIDAL MANJAPPA.—Sir, this is a peculiar situation. After I moved the amendment when I was about to explain the provisions of the amendment at that time there was a move that it should be postponed.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—If you explain it at least at this stage, it would minimise the discusssion.

Sri KADIDAL MANJAPPA.—In the case of existing holdings, it would be 27 standard acres ; in the case of future holdings, it would be 18 standard acres.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—What about (*b*) of sub-clause 6 ?

Sri KADIDAL MANJAPPA.—Supposing a person is owning less than 27 standard acres ; he will be entitled to have up to that ceiling. If he is holding 1,000 acres of specialised farm or sugarcane farm, he will not be entitled for any ceiling area in addition to what he is already owning.

Sri M. C. NARASIMHAN.—Sir, so far as the last sub-clause proposed by the Minister is concerned, it is really interesting. I thought it was a rather innocuous section. It is not really so. Sir, this section is not at all warranted. Why these religious and charitable institutions should not be capable of managing their affairs within 27 standard acres is beyond ones understanding. Twenty-Seven standard acres means quite a good sum of money. They can manage their affairs within the ambit of 27 standard acres. My submission is, why should they not be brought within the ambit of the ceiling. Sir, orchards are exempted on one principle whether I accept or not, that it is an efficiently managed area and if the orchards are broken, it will lead to break in the foreign exchange Such a thing cannot be applied for the religious and charitable institutions. Sir, there may be one institution which may own vast area of land and others may not. That is why, I do not see any valid justification in this. So far as Maharashtra Act is concerned, it is a little more precise. Section 47 (1) of that Act says that land held by a public trust, major portion of income of such land being appropriated for the purpose of education or medical relief or wherever major portion of the income is not so appropriated, an undertaking in the prescribed form is to be given within six months to the Collector that the major portion of income of such land from the appointed day be appropriated for such purposes.

2-30 P.M.

So Sir, this is the only clause in the Maharashtra Act which can be somewhat related or brought on a bar with our present clause under

discussion which the Revenue Minister wants us to accept as amendment to the original clause. Even this religious or educational institutions must discharge certain functions and it is on the basis of that function that we can give exemption. It must be that purpose. One can understand that it should be removed from the purview of the ceiling limit, Here it is a very dangerous clause—it is not merely religious or charitable or other institutions. I understand 'other institutions'. To-morrow, you may say any institution is outside the purview of the ceiling legislation. The word 'or other' makes it perfectly clear that exemption is not intended to be given exclusively to religious or charitable institutions. If the institution is something apart from religious or charitable, then also it comes within the clause of exemption. Is it really fair ? Under this any institution can claim exemption. If I cannot claim exemption as an individual, I can join an institution or convert into an institution and then claim exemption. Supposing the Congress Party holds lands in excess of the ceiling then it can claim exemption under this clause.

Sri M. RAMAPPA.—You mean, the M. P. C. C. ?

Sri M. C. NARASIMHAN.—Any sporting club, social club or any club for a matter of that can definitely claim exemption, under this clause. I think this is really extraordinary ! By this, you can defeat the entire clause and the entire Bill. Why don't you frankly say that you will remove ceiling. Government will be well-advised to say that they do not believe in ceiling legislation. Why bring this provision 'other institutions' So far as the last clause is concerned. I oppose it. Religious and charitable institutions cannot be given a blank exemption. I can understand exemption can be given only for institutions solely and wholly devoted to religious and charitable purposes. But there are religious institutions which operate as communal institutions. That is not fair. I have no objection if exemption is given on the ground that they are devoted to educational and medical relief.

With these words, I have got to say one thing about my own amendment.

My amendment is very simple and it is a repetition of Section 11 of the Maharashtra Act. I therefore move :

> "That a new sub-clause shall be added at the end of the proposed clause :
>
> If as a result of irrigation from a source constructed by Government any land held by a person after the appointed day is converted into any class of land mentioned in schedule I Part A, and thereby the holding of the person exceeds the ceiling area, the land so in excess shall be deemed to be surplus land accordingly the provisions of this Act shall apply to the holding."

Mr. SPEAKER.—The House will now adjourn and meet after half-an-hour.

The House adjourned for recess at Forty Minutes past Two of the Clock and reassembled at Eighteen Minutes past Three of the Clock.

[Mr. SPEAKER in the Chair.]

Sri M. C. NARASIMHAN.—I was speaking on the last amendment which I proposed in respect of Clause 63. That only says that if by reason of some cancellation or something like that, the classification of land is changed, then it should be brought within the ceiling limit and the provisions of the Act should apply naturally to such land. Now it was said that Section 75 is an answer to what I have given by way of amendment and that it is not necessary therefore to give credence to what I have said. I submit that there is a slight difference. Section 75 says: that "where a person holds land not exceeding the ceiling limit referred to Sections 63 or 64, but subsequently the land held exceeds the ceiling limit, due to any change in the classification of the land consequent upon any improvements effected in the land by such person or of the family or due to a decrease in the number of members of the family, then notwithstanding anything contained in this Chapter, such person shall not be required to surrender any part of the land on the ground that it is excess land." It enumerates that if it is due to personal efforts, even if it exceeds the ceiling limit, it shall be disregarded. What I have stated categrically provides for a different contingency and Section 75 does not satisfactorily answer. If the acquisitions were to change due to an irrigation project, then in spite of the ceiling limit of 18 standard acres for future acquisition a person would be entitled to hold 27 standard acres.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—Sir, at least at this stage I want the Hon'ble Revenue Minister to explain the circumstances under which this mendment was brought it because it would facilitate further discussion.

Sri KADIDAL MANJAPPA.—I have no objection if the Chair permits.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Yes. We can.

†Sri KADIDAL MANJAPPA.—The amendments I have moved to Clause 63 can be divided into two parts. One part consists of the provisions which are already there in Clause 63 and the other part, the new provisions. In Clause 63 in the existing clause, the explanation is there, the 1st clause is there, the clause relating to agricultural land and forest land is also there. The only new clause I have introduced is to the effect that in the case of persons holding land on the appointed day,

other than a person holding land cultivated by plantation crops, the provisions of sub-section (1) shall apply as if the ceiling area were 27 standard acres. In the case of existing holders, the ceiling area will be 27 standard acres and in the case of future acquisitions 18 standard acres. The other day my friends made much of this that I have sprung a surprise on the Opposition benches. This is an improvement on the report of the Select Committee. The Select Committee had proposed an uniform ceiling area of 27 standard acres. My amendment seeks to reduce the ceiling area in the case of future acquisitions. In the case of plantation crops I have already tabled an amendment according to which all the plantations will be exempted from the operation of the ceiling whether future or present. In addition to the exempted extent to be held by the plantation owner, he is allowed to have one ceiling area of agricultural land whether interspersed within the boundaries of the plantations or outside the plantations. The plantation owner is entitled to have lands reserved for plantations up to a ceiling limit of 100 acres. He is also allowed to have lands for ancillary pu.poses.

The other new clause relates to the area of land which a owner of land uses as sugarcane farms, land utilised by efficiently managed farms. According to the existing provision, sugarcane farm owner and efficiently managed farm owner can have in addition to the area already in his possession or ownership, one more ceiling area. I have thought that it is not necessary for him to own one more ceiling area in cases where the extent is already more than a ceiling area. For instance if a man has got efficiently managed farms consisting of 2,000 acres, according to the wordings if the Select Committee, he can have one more ceiling area. My amendment seeks to reduce the limit upto the extent he is already owning or upto a ceiling area. I wil l explain this further. This ceiling specified in Section 63 does not apply to lands used as sugarcane farms operated by the sugar factories and lands utilised by efficiently managed farms which are owned by persons on the appointed day. Whatever the area a man can have that extent, even upto 2,000 acres. Whatever the extent, he should be satisfied with the extent already held by him if it is in excess of the ceiling area. But if it is land within the ceiling area, he will be allowed to have upto one ceiling area. I have tabled an amendment that if the extent owned by him exceeds the ceiling, he cannot be permitted to have one more ceiling.

Sri B. G. Khot.—It may kindly be explained again.

† ಶ್ರೀ ಕಡಿದಾಳ್ ಮಂಜಪ್ಪ.—ಈಗಿರತಕ್ಕ ಸೆಕ್ಷನ್ 63 (2)ರ ಪ್ರಕಾರ ಶುಗರ್ ಫ್ಯಾಕ್ಟರಿಗಳು ಮತ್ತು ಶುಗರ್ ಕೇನ್ ಫಾರಂ ಮತ್ತು ಎಫಿಶಿಯಂಟಲಿ ಮ್ಯಾನೇಜಡ್ ಎಸ್ಟೇಟುಗಳು ಸೀಲಿಂಗ್ ನಿರ್ಬಂಧದಿಂದ ವಿನಾಯಿತಿಗೆ ಒಳಪಟ್ಟಿವೆ. ಶುಗರ್ ಕೇನ್ ಫಾರಂ ಅಥವ ಎಫಿಶಿಯಂಟಲಿ ಮಾನೇಜ್‌ಡ್ ಫಾರಮ್ಸುಗಳ ವಿಸ್ತೀರ್ಣ ಸಾವಿರ ಎಕರೆ ಇದ್ದರೂ ಕೂಡ ಅವನ್ನು ಇಟ್ಟುಕೊಳ್ಳುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಅವಕಾಶ ಕಲ್ಪಿಸಿಕೊಟ್ಟಿದೆ. ಅದರ ಜೊತೆಗೆ ಈಗಿರತಕ್ಕ ನಿರ್ಬಂಧದ ಪ್ರಕಾರ

(ಶ್ರೀ ಕಡಿದಾಳ್ ಮಂಜಪ್ಪ)

ಮಾಲೀಕ ಇನ್ನೊಂದು ಪರಿಮಿತಿ ವಿಸ್ತೀರ್ಣವನ್ನು ಹೊಂದುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಅವಕಾಶವಿದೆ. ಹಾಗೆ ಅವಕಾಶವಿರಬಾರದು ಒಂದು ಸೀಲಿಂಗ್ ಏರಿಯಾಗಿಂತ ಅವನಿಗೆ ಜಾಸ್ತಿ ಜಮೀನು ಇದ್ದರೆ ಇನ್ನೊಂದು ಸೀಲಿಂಗ್ ಏರಿಯಾ ಕೊಡಬಾರದು ಎನ್ನುವುದೇ ನನ್ನ ತಿದ್ದುಪಡಿಯ ಉದ್ದೇಶ. Religious chaiitable or other Instrtutions ಎಂತ ಇರುವುದು ತಪ್ಪು. ಅದು or educational institutions ಅಂತ ಇರಬೇಕಾಗಿದೆ. ಧಾರ್ಮಿಕ ಸಂಸ್ಥೆಗಳಿಗೆ ಸೇರಿದ ಜಮೀನುಗಳಿಗೆ, ಅವುಗಳು ಸ್ವಂತ ಸಾಗುವಳಿ ಮಾಡುತ್ತಾ ಇದ್ದರೆ, ಅವುಗಳಿಗೆ ಸೀಲಿಂಗ್ ನಿಗದಿ ಮಾಡಬಾರದು. ಗೇಣೀದಾರರು ಸ್ವಂತ ಸಾಗುವಳಿ ಮಾಡುತ್ತಾ ಇದ್ದರೆ, ಅಂಥ ಗೇಣೀದಾರರಿಂದ ಭೂಮಾಲೀಕರು ಜಮೀನನ್ನು ಬಿಡಿಸಿಕೊಳ್ಳುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಆಗಬಾರದು ಎಂದು ನಾವು ನಿರ್ಬಂಧ ಹಾಕಿದ್ದೇವೆ. ಧಾರ್ಮಿಕ ಸಂಸ್ಥೆಗಳ ಜಮೀನನ್ನು ಸಾಗುವಳಿ ಮಾಡುತ್ತಿರುವ ಜಮೀನುದಾರರೆಲ್ಲರೂ ಕೂಡ ಜಮೀನಿನ ಮಾಲೀಕರಾಗುತ್ತಾರೆ ಏಕೆಂದರೆ ಅವರ ಸಾಗುವಳಿಯಲ್ಲಿರುವ ಜಮೀನು ನಾನ್-ರೆಸ್ಯೂಮಬಲ್ ಆಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಇದೇ ಈ ತಿದ್ದುಪಡಿಯ ಉದ್ದೇಶ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಜಿ. ಎನ್. ಪುಟ್ಟಣ್ಣ.—Efficiently managed farm ಎಂದರೆ ಏನು ಎಂದು ತಾವು ಡಿಸ್ಕ್ರೈಬ್ ಮಾಡಿಲ್ಲ. Definition should not contain the term defined but the definition should be precise.

ಶ್ರೀ ಕಡಿದಾಳ್ ಮಂಜಪ್ಪ.—ಪ್ಲಾನಿಂಗ್ ಕಮಿಶನ್ ರೆಕಮೆಂಡೇಶನ್ಸ್ ನಮ್ಮ ಹತ್ತಿರ ಇದ್ದರೆ, ಓದಿದರೆ ಗೊತ್ತಾಗುತ್ತದೆ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಜಿ. ಎನ್. ಪುಟ್ಟಣ್ಣ.—ಅದರಲ್ಲಿರಬಹುದು, ಕ್ರಿಮಿನಲ್ ಪ್ರೊಸೀಜರ್ ಕೋಡಿನಲ್ಲಿರಬಹುದು. ಇಲ್ಲಿ ಇಲ್ಲವಲ್ಲಾ ಆಮೇಲೆ ಕಾಂಪ್ಯಾಕ್ಟ್ ಏರಿಯಾ ಏನು ಎಂದು ಡಿಸ್ಕ್ರೈಬ್ ಮಾಡಿಲ್ಲ ಆಮೇಲೆ ಕಾಂಪ್ಲಿಕೇಶನ್ ಬರುತ್ತದೆ. ಒಂದು ಎಕರೆ ಬಂದರೆ 50 ಗಾಡಿ ಗೊಬ್ಬರ ಹಾಕಬೇಕೇ. 30 ಸಾರಿ ಉಪ್ಪು ಹೊಡೆಯಬೇಕೆ? ಇದನ್ನು ಹೇಗೆ ಇಂಪ್ಲಿಮೆಂಟ್ ಮಾಡುವುದು?

ಶ್ರೀ ಕಡಿದಾಳ್ ಮಂಜಪ್ಪ.—ಸರಿಯಾಗಿದೆ; ಪ್ಲಾನಿಂಗ್ ಕಮೀಶನ್ನಿನವರು ಏನು ಸೂಚನೆ ಮಾಡಿದ್ದಾರೋ ಅದನ್ನು ನಾವು ಒಪ್ಪಿಕೊಂಡಿದ್ದೇವೆ. ಪ್ಲಾನಿಂಗ್ ಕಮಿಶನ್ನಿನ ಸೂಚನೆಯಲ್ಲಿ

Efficiently managed farm which consists of compact blocks on which heavy investments or permanent structural improvements have been made whose breakup is likely to lead to fall in production.

ಎಂದಿದೆ. ಆ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಸಂಸ್ಥಾನದಲ್ಲಿ ಇಂಥ ಡೆಫಿನಿಶನ್ ಮಾಡಿದ್ದೇವೆ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಜಿ. ಎನ್. ಪುಟ್ಟಣ್ಣ.—ಅದು ನಿಮ್ಮ ಲ್ಯಾಂಡ್ ರಿಫಾರ್ಮ್ಸ್ ಬಿಲ್ಲಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಎಲ್ಲಿದೆ? ನಾನು ಓದಿದ್ದೇನೆ, ನನಗೆ ಏಕೆ ಅರ್ಥವಾಗಲಿಲ್ಲ.

Sri KADIDAL MANJAPPA.—It says: Lands utilised by an efficiently managed farm which consist of reasonable compact area on which heavy investment or permanent structural improvements have been made and whose breakup in the opinion of the Tribunal is likely to lead to fall in production.

Sri G. N. PUTTANNA.—Logic says that a definition should not contain the term it defines.

Sri KADIDAL MANJAPPA.—If you look at the clause you will find Heavy investment or permanent structural improvements as may be prescribed Efficiently managed farm as may be prescribed ಅಂದರೆ, ರೂಲ್ಸಿನಲ್ಲಿ ತರುತ್ತೇವೆ.

Sri G. VENKATAI GOWDA.—Does it apply to existing holdings or future holdings?

ಶ್ರೀ ಕಡಿದಾಳ್ ಮಂಜಪ್ಪ.—ಕ್ಲಾಸ್ (2) ಓದಿದರೆ ಇಷ್ಟು ಶ್ರಮ ಪಡಬೇಕಾಗಿಲ್ಲ. In the case of any prson holding land on the appointed day ಎಂದಿದೆ.

Sri V. SRINIVASA SHETTY.—What is the ambit of the activities of the religious intstitutions. Which are those religious institutions; who are those charitable and educational institutions.

ಶ್ರೀ ಕಡಿದಾಳ್ ಮಂಜಪ್ಪ.—ಶ್ರೀನಿವಾಸ ಶೆಟ್ಟರಿಗೆ ಪ್ರತಿಯೊಂದೂ ಗೊತ್ತಿದೆ. ದಕ್ಷ ರಾಯರು. ಪ್ರತಿಯೊಂದು ವರ್ಗಿಗೂ ಒಂದೊಂದು ಡೆಫಿನಿಶನ್ ಕಾನೂನಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಸಾಧ್ಯವೇ? ರಿಲಿಜಿಯಸ್ ಅಂತ, ಚಾರಿಟಬಲ್ ಅಂತ ಹೇಳಿದರೆ ಸಾಮಾನ್ಯವಾಗಿ ಗೊತ್ತಾದ ವಿಚಾರ. ಬೋಗಸ್ ಸಂಸ್ಥೆಗಳಿದ್ದರೆ, ಟ್ರಿಬ್ಯೂನಲ್‌ನವರು ನಿಜವಾದ ಸಂಸ್ಥೆ ಯಾವುದು ಎಂದು ನಿರ್ಧರಿಸುತ್ತಾರೆ.

Sri M. C. NARASIMHAN.—In sub-clause (2) you have referred to plantations but again in sub-clause (4) you say agricultural land. So far as that agricultural land is concerned, will it be 18 standard acres or 27 standard acres?

Sri KADIDAL MANJAPPA.—18 standard acres in addition to the exempted plantation area.

ಶ್ರೀ ಎಂ. ಎಂ. ಬಸವೇಗೌಡ.—20 ಎಕರೆ ಕಾಫೀ ತೋಟವಿದ್ದರೆ, ಪರ್ಸೊನಲ್ ಕಲ್ಟಿವೇಶನ್ ಮಾಡುತ್ತಾ ಇರುವವರಿಗೂ 18 ಸ್ಟ್ಯಾಂಡರ್ಡ್ ಎಕರೆಗಳೇ!

ಶ್ರೀ ಕಡಿದಾಳ್ ಮಂಜಪ್ಪ.—ಹೌದು ಎಲ್ಲರಿಗೂ ಅದೇ, ಕಾಫೀ ತೋಟ ಇಲ್ಲದೆ ಇದ್ದವರಿಗೂ ಅಷ್ಟೇ ಮಾಡಿದ್ದೇವೆ ಮುಂದೆ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಎಂ. ರಾಮಪ್ಪ.—ಸ್ವಾಮಿ, ಈ 63ನೇ ಕ್ಲಾಜು ಮಸೂದೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಪರಿಮಿತಿಯನ್ನು ನಿಶ್ಚಯಗೊಳಿಸತಕ್ಕಂಥ ಕ್ಲಾಸ್ ಆದ್ದರಿಂದ, ಈ ಭೂಸುಧಾರಣೆ ವಿಷಯದಲ್ಲಿ ಸರ್ಕಾರದ ನಿಲುವನ್ನು ಜನತೆ ನಿರ್ಣಯಿಸಬೇಕಾಗಿದೆ. ಮಾನ್ಯ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳು ಸೆಲೆಕ್ಟ್ ಕಮಿಟಿಗಿಂತ ಇದರಲ್ಲಿ ಇಂಪ್ರೂವ್‌ಮೆಂಟ್ ಆಗಿದೆ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಿದರು. ತಮ್ಮ ಇಂಪ್ರೂವ್‌ಮೆಂಟ್ ಏನು ಎನ್ನುವುದನ್ನು ನಾವು ತಿಳಿದುಕೊಂಡಿದ್ದೇವೆ. future acquisitionsಗೆ 18 ಎಕರೆ ಎಂದಿದೆ. ಆ ವಿಷಯದಲ್ಲಿ ಇಂಪ್ರೂವ್‌ಮೆಂಟ್ ಆಗಿದೆ ಎನ್ನುವುದನ್ನು ಒಪ್ಪಿಕೊಳ್ಳುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಆದರೆ ಈ future acquisition ಅನ್ನತಕ್ಕಂಥಾದ್ದು ಏನು ಎನ್ನುವುದು ಜನತೆಗೆ ಗೊತ್ತಿಲ್ಲ. ಇದು ಬಿಸಿಲುಗುದುರೆ ಇದ್ದ ಹಾಗೆ ಮುಂದಿನ ಕ್ಲಾಜಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಸೀಲಿಂಗ್ ಹಾಕುತ್ತೇವೆಂದು ಹೇಳಿದೀರಲ್ಲ, ಇದರಿಂದ ಜಮೀನು ಎಷ್ಟು ಹೊಸದಾಗಿ ಬರುವುದು?

ಶ್ರೀ ಕಡಿದಾಳ್ ಮಂಜಪ್ಪ.—If you want clarification, I will tell you. ಅಪಾಯಿಂಟೆಡ್‌ಡೇ, ಕಾನೂನು ಜಾರಿಗೆ ಬಂದ ದಿವಸ, ಉದಾಹರಣೆಗೆ ನನಗೆ 500 ಎಕರೆ ಇದ್ದರೆ (ನನಗೆ ಅಷ್ಟು ಇಲ್ಲ), ನಾನು ಇಟ್ಟುಕೊಳ್ಳಬಹುದು, subject to the other provision relating resumption. ಅವತ್ತಿನ ದಿವಸ ಜಮೀನು ಇಲ್ಲದೆ, ನಂತರ ಬೇರೆ ಜಮೀನನ್ನು ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳಬೇಕೆಂದು ಹೇಳಿದರೆ 18 ಎಕರೆ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಎಂ. ರಾಮಪ್ಪ.—ತಾವು ಸೆಲೆಕ್ಟ್ ಕಮಿಟಿಯಲ್ಲಿರಬಹುದು ಹೊಸದಾಗಿ ತಾವು ಏನು ಹೇಳಬಲ್ಲಿರಿ? I claim better knowledge because I happen to be on the committees in this matter. ಈಗ ನೀವು ಭೂಸುಧಾರಣೆ ಕಾನೂನು ಮಾಡಿ ಜಾರಿಗೆ ತರುವುದರಿಂದ ಜನತೆಗೆ ಏನು ಉಪಯೋಗವಾಗುತ್ತದೆ?

ಶ್ರೀ ಕಡಿದಾಳ್ ಮಂಜಪ್ಪ.—ನೀವು ಏಕೆ ರೆಕಮೆಂಡ್ ಮಾಡಿದಿರಿ?

ಶ್ರೀ ಎಂ. ರಾಮಪ್ಪ.—ನಾನು ಏನು ಮಾತನಾಡುತ್ತೇನೆ ಎನ್ನುವುದನ್ನು ಅವರಿಗೆ ಗೊತ್ತಿದೆ, ಅದಕ್ಕೇ ಅವರು ನನಗೆ ಬ್ರೇಕ್ ಹಾಕುತ್ತಾರೆ. ಈ ಭೂಸುಧಾರಣೆಯನ್ನು ಜಾರಿ ಮಾಡುವ ಉದ್ದೇಶವೇನು? ಜನಗಳಿಗೆ ಭೂಮಿಯ ಒಂದು ಹಾಹಾಕಾರವಿದೆ, ಭೂಮಿ ಕಡಿಮೆ ಇದೆ. ಅದೇ ಕಾನೂನು ಮಾಡುವ ಮುಖ್ಯ ಉದ್ದೇಶ, ಎರಡನೇದು ಗೇಣೀದಾರರನ್ನು ಮಾಲೀಕರನ್ನಾಗಿ ಮಾಡುವ ಉದ್ದೇಶ. ಭೂಮಿಯ ಹಾಹಾಕಾರ ಇದೆ. ಇದನ್ನು ಕಡಮೆ ಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೋಸ್ಕರ, ಈ ಕಾನೂನನ್ನು ಇಂಪ್ಲಿಮೆಂಟು ಮಾಡಿದರೆ ಹೆಚ್ಚು ಭೂಮಿ ಬರಬಹುದು ಎನ್ನುವುದು ಇದರ ಮುಖ್ಯ ಉದ್ದೇಶ. ಇವತ್ತಿನ ದಿವಸ ಪ್ರಸೆಂಟ್ ಹೋಲ್ಡಿಂಗ್ ಎಷ್ಟೋ ಇದ್ದರೆ, ಅದರ ಮೇಲೆ ಪರಿಮಾಧಿಯನ್ನು ಹಾಕಿ ನಮಗೆ ಹೆಚ್ಚಿನ ಭೂಮಿ ಬೇಕಾಗಿದೆ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳುತ್ತಾ ಫ್ಯೂಚರ್ ಹೋಲ್ಡಿಂಗುಗಳ ಮೇಲೆ ಸೀಲಿಂಗನ್ನು ಹಾಕುವುದರಿಂದ ಹೆಚ್ಚಿನ ಭೂಮಿ ಬರುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಇದರ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಒಂದು ಉದಾಹರಣೆಯನ್ನು ಕೊಡುತ್ತೇನೆ. ನಾವು ಮೊದಲು ನಮ್ಮ ಸದಸ್ಯ ಮಂಜಪ್ಪನವರು ಬಹಳವಾದ ಪ್ರಗತಿ ಭಾವನೆಯುಳ್ಳವರು ಎನ್ನುವ ಗೌರವವನ್ನು ಇಟ್ಟುಕೊಂಡಿದ್ದೆವು. ಈಗ ಆ ಗೌರವನ್ನು ಕಳೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳುತ್ತಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಈಗ ನೀವು ಹೇಳುವಂತೆ 27 ಎಕೆರೆಗಳಷ್ಟು ಎಂದು ಸೆಲೆಕ್ಟ್ ಕಮಿಟಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಮಾಡಿಸಿದ್ದುದನ್ನು ಕಾಂಗ್ರೆಸ್‌ನ ಪಾರ್ಟಿಯವರು 18 ಎಕೆರೆಗೆ ಇಳಿಸಿ ಬಿಟ್ಟರು ಎಂದು ಜನರಿಗೆ ಮೋಸ ಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕಾಗಿ ಪೇಪರುಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ದೊಡ್ಡದಾಗಿ 18 ಎಕೆರೆಗಳು ಎಂದು ತಿದ್ದುಪಡಿ ಮಾಡಿಸಿಬಿಟ್ಟರು. ಇದರಿಂದ ಜನಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ತಪ್ಪು ಭಾವನೆಯನ್ನುಂಟು ಮಾಡಿದಂತಾಗಲಿಲ್ಲವೇ? ಇದರಿಂದ ನಿಮಗೆ ಹಂಚಲು ಭೂಮಿ ಎಲ್ಲಿ ಸಿಗುತ್ತದೆ? ಜನತೆಗೆ ಮೋಸ ಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕಾಗಿ ಮೈಸೂರಿನಲ್ಲಿರುವ ಕಾಂಗ್ರೆಸ್ ಸರಕಾರದವರು 18 ಎಕೆರೆಗಳಿಗೆ ಇಳಿಸಿದರು ಎಂದು ಜನತೆಗೆ ಮಾಡುವ ಮೋಸವಲ್ಲವೇ? ಇದು ಫ್ರಾಡ್ ಆಗಲಿಲ್ಲವೇ?

ಶ್ರೀ ಕಡಿದಾಳ್ ಮಂಜಪ್ಪ.—ಇದರಲ್ಲಿ Fraud ಏನು ಬಂತು? ನಿರ್ದಿಷ್ಟವಾಗಿ On the appointed day it is 27 acres. ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಿದೆ.

ಶ್ರೀ ವಿ. ಶ್ರೀನಿವಾಸ ಶೆಟ್ಟಿ.—ಸೀಲಿಂಗು ಡೆಫನಿಷನ್ನಿನಲ್ಲಿ 18 ಎಕೆರೆಗಳೆಂದು ಯಾರಿಗೆ ಗೊತ್ತು?

ಶ್ರೀ ಎಂ. ರಾಮಪ್ಪ.—ಇಲ್ಲಿ ತಿದ್ದುಪಡಿಯನ್ನು ತಂದು 18 ಎಕೆರೆ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಿಸಿಬಿಟ್ಟರಿ. ಇದರಿಂದ ಆಡಳಿತ ಪಕ್ಷದವರಲ್ಲಿನ ಪ್ರಗತಿ ಮನೋಭಾವನೆಯಿಂದ ಇದು ಬದಲಾವಣೆಯಾಗಿದೆ. ಅವರೇನೋ ಸೆಲೆಕ್ಟ್ ಸಮಿತಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಎಲ್ಲರೂ ಭೂ ಮಾಲೀಕರೇ ಆಗಿದ್ದವರು ಸದಸ್ಯರಾಗಿದ್ದುದರಿಂದ ಅಲ್ಲೇನೂ ರಿಯಾಯತಿ ತೋರಿಸುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಆಗಲಿಲ್ಲ. ಆದುದರಿಂದ ಇಲ್ಲಿ ಕಾಂಗ್ರೆಸ್ಸಿನ ಪಕ್ಷದವರು ಈ ರೀತಿ ಮಾಡಿಸಿದರು ಎಂದು ನಾವು ತಿಳಿದುಕೊಂಡಿದ್ದೆವು. 18 ಎಕೆರೆಗಳಷ್ಟು ರೆನ್ಯೂಮು ಮಾಡಬಹುದು ಎಂದು ಹೇಗೆ ತಿದ್ದುಪಡಿಯನ್ನು ತಂದಿರಿ ಈಗ 18 ಎಕೆರೆಯಷ್ಟು ಎಂದು ಇದ್ದುದನ್ನು 27 ಎಕೆರೆ ಎಂದು ಮಾಡಿದರು? ಆ ರೀತಿ ಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಅವಕಾಶವಿರಲಿಲ್ಲ. ಈ ರೀತಿಯಾದ ಸೀಲಿಂಗಿನ ಡೆಫನಿಷನ್ನನ್ನು ಹೇಗೆ ತಂದಿರಿ? ಈ ರೀತಿಯಾಗಿ ಇಲ್ಲಿ ತಂದು ಜನತೆಗೆ ಮೋಸ ಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೇ ಹೊರತು ಬೇರೆ ಯಾವ ಉದ್ದೇಶವೂ ಇಲ್ಲ ಎಂದು ಇಲ್ಲಿ ಹೇಳಲು ಇಚ್ಛೆಪಡುತ್ತೇನೆ. ತಾವು ಸಂಯುಕ್ತ ಪರಿಶೀಲನಾ ಸಮಿತಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ನಿವ್ವಳ ಉತ್ಪನ್ನ 5,4,00 ರೂಪಾಯಿಗಳಷ್ಟು ಇರಬೇಕು ಎನ್ನುವುದುದನ್ನು ಪರಿಶೀಲಿಸಿ ಯಾವ ರೀತಿ ಎಕ್ಸೆಂಪ್ಷನನ್ನು ಕೊಡಬೇಕು ಎನ್ನುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಒಂದು ಮಿನಿಮಂ ಆಗಿರುವ ಉದಾಹರಣೆಯನ್ನು ಹೇಳುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಈಗ 27 ಎಕೆರೆಗಳಷ್ಟು ಜಮೀನಿಗೆ ಎಷ್ಟು ನಿವ್ವಳ ಉತ್ಪನ್ನ ಬರುತ್ತದೆ ಎನ್ನುವುದನ್ನು ಸ್ವಲ್ಪ ಲೆಕ್ಕಾಚಾರ ಮಾಡೋಣ. ತಾವು 5,400 ರೂಪಾಯಿಗಳಷ್ಟು ಉತ್ಪನ್ನ ಬರಬಹುದು ಎನ್ನುವಂತೆ 27 ಸ್ಟ್ಯಾಂಡರ್ಡ್ ಎಕೆರೆಗಳಿಗೆ ನೀವು ಒಪ್ಪಿಕೊಳ್ಳುವಂತೆ ಎಷ್ಟು ಬರಬಹುದು ಎಂದರೆ, ಒಂದು ಎಕೆರೆ ಜಮೀನಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಎರಡು ಬೆಳೆ ಬೆಳೆಯುತ್ತಾರೆಂದು ಇಟ್ಟುಕೊಳ್ಳೋಣ. ಇದರಲ್ಲಿ ಮಿನಿಮಮ್ ಈಗ

ಒಂದು ಬೆಳೆಗೆ ಸುಮಾರು ಹತ್ತು ಪಲ್ಲ ದವಸ ಬರಬಹುದು ಒಂದು ಪಲ್ಲಕ್ಕೆ 30 ರೂಪಾಯಿಗಳು ಎಂದು ಬೆಲೆ ಇಟ್ಟುಕೊಂಡರೆ ಸುಮಾರು 300 ರೂಪಾಯಿಗಳಷ್ಟು ಆಯಿತು. ಇದರಲ್ಲಿ ಖರ್ಚಿಗಾಗಿ ಅರ್ಧದಷ್ಟು ಹೋಗುತ್ತದೆ, ಎಂದರೆ ಸುಮಾರು 150 ರೂಪಾಯಿಗಳಷ್ಟು ಹೋಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಎಂದರೆ ಒಂದು ಬೆಳೆಗೆ 150 ರೂಪಾಯಿಗಳಾದರೆ ಎರಡು ಬೆಳೆಗೆ ಸುಮಾರು 300ರೂಪಾಯಿಗಳಷ್ಟು ಆಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಇದರಂತೆ 27 ಎಕರೆಗಳಿಗೆ ಸುಮಾರು 8,100 ರೂಪಾಯಿಗಳು ಆಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಇದರಂತೆ ನೋಡಿದರೆ ಹೆಚ್ಚಿಗೆ ಜಮೀನು ಹಂಚುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಹೇಗೆ ಸಿಗುತ್ತದೆ? ತಾವು ಜತ್ತಿ ಸಮಿತಿಯ ವರದಿಯನ್ನು ನೋಡಿಕೊಂಡು, ಮತ್ತು ಪ್ಲಾನಿಂಗು ಕಮಿಷನ್ನಿನ ಆದೇಶವನ್ನೂ ಇಟ್ಟುಕೊಂಡು ಈ ರೀತಿ ಏಕೆ ವಿರೋಧವಾಗಿ ಮಾಡುತ್ತಿದ್ದೀರಿ? ಇದಕ್ಕೆ ಆಗ ಏಕೆ ಯಾವ ಸಮಜಾಷಿಯನ್ನೂ ಕೊಡಲಿಲ್ಲ. ತಾವು ಪ್ರಗತಿಗಾಮಿಯಾಗಿ ಈ ರೀತಿಯಾದ ತಿದ್ದುಪಡಿಯನ್ನು ತಂದಿರುವುದರಿಂದ ನಾನು ಈ ತಿದ್ದುಪಡಿಯನ್ನು ವಿರೋಧಿಸಬೇಕಾಗಿದೆ. ಎರಡು ಲಕ್ಷ ಎಕರೆಗಳಷ್ಟು ಭೂಮಿ ಸಿಗುತ್ತದೆ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಿರುವಾಗ ಇಲ್ಲಿ ಹಾಕಿರುವ ಸೀಲಿಂಗ್ ಲಿಮಿಟ್ಟನ್ನು ಹಾಕಿರುವುದನ್ನು ನಾವು ಮುಖ್ಯವಾಗಿ ಗಮನಿಸಬೇಕಾಗಿದೆ. ಈ ರೀತಿಯಾದ ಸೀಲಿಂಗನ್ನು ನಿಗದಿ ಮಾಡಿರುವಾಗ ಎಷ್ಟು ಎಕರೆಗಳಷ್ಟು ಭೂಮಿ ಹೆಚ್ಚಾಗಿ ಸಿಗುತ್ತದೆ? ಅಲ್ಲದೆ ಇಲ್ಲಿ ಸ್ಟ್ಯಾಂಡರ್ಡು ಎಕರೆ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಿರುವುದು ಯಾವ ವರ್ಗಕ್ಕೆ ಸೇರಿದುದು ಎನ್ನುವುದನ್ನು ಸರಿಯಾಗಿ ವಿಷಾದೀಕರಿಸಿಲ್ಲ. ಒಂದು ಪಕ್ಷ ನಮ್ಮ ಚಿತ್ರದುರ್ಗದ ಕಡೆಯಲ್ಲಿರುವ ಭಾಗದಲ್ಲಿ 2 ಲಕ್ಷ ಎಕರೆಗಳು ಎಂದು ಇಟ್ಟುಕೊಂಡರೆ ಅವರಿಗೆ ಭೂಮಿ ಹೇಗೆ ಬರುತ್ತದೆ? ಒಬ್ಬೊಬ್ಬರಿಗೆ ಎರಡು ಎಕರೆಗಳಷ್ಟು ಕೊಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಭೂಮಿಯೇ ಸಿಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಈಗಿರುವವರೆ ಪರಮಾವಧಿ 27 ಎಕರೆಗಳು ಎಂದು ಮತ್ತು ಮುಂದೆ ಅಕ್ವೈರು ಮಾಡಿಕೊಳ್ಳುವಾಗ 18 ಎಕರೆಗಳಷ್ಟು ಎಂದು ಏಕೆ ಮಾಡಿದಿರಿ? ಸೀಲಿಂಗಿನ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ನಮ್ಮ ಪಾರ್ಟಿಯವರ ತಿದ್ದುಪಡಿಯನ್ನು ಕಳುಹಿಸಿದಾಗ ತಾವು ಒಪ್ಪಲಿಲ್ಲ. ನಾವೆಲ್ಲಾ ಒಂದು ತತ್ವಕ್ಕೆ ಒಪ್ಪಿಕೊಂಡ ಮೇಲೆ ಅದಕ್ಕನುಸಾರವಾಗಿ ನಾವುಗಳು ಕಳುಹಿಸಿದ ತಿದ್ದುಪಡಿಯನ್ನು ತಾವು ಒಪ್ಪಿಕೊಳ್ಳಲಿಲ್ಲ? ಆದುದರಿಂದ ತಾವು ಹೇಳುವಂತೆ ಎರಡು ಲಕ್ಷ ಎಕರೆಗಳಷ್ಟು ಜಮೀನು ಸಿಗುತ್ತದೆ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳುವಾಗ ಯಾವ ವರ್ಗಕ್ಕೆ ಸೇರಿದುದು ಎನ್ನುವುದನ್ನು ಹೇಳುವಾಗ 25 ಇಂಚಿಗಿಂತ ಕಡಿಮೆ ಮಳೆ ಬರುದಂತಹ ಖುಷ್ಕಿ ಜಮೀನು ಎಂದು ತಾವು ವಿತರಣೆ ಕೊಡಬಹುದು. ಇದನ್ನು ಯಾವ ಆಧಾರದ ಮೇಲೆ ಹೇಳುತ್ತೀರಿ? ಸೆಲೆಕ್ಟ್ ಕಮಿಟಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಅಮೆಂಡುಮೆಂಟನ್ನು ರಿಲಿಜಸ್ ಇನ್‌ಸ್ಟಿಟ್ಯೂಷನ್‌ಗಳಿಗೆ ಏಕೆ ಕೊಡಲಿಲ್ಲ? ನಿಮಗೆ ಪ್ಲಾನಿಂಗು ಕಮಿಷನ್ನಿನವರು ಹೇಳಿದ್ದಾರೇ ಇಲ್ಲವೆ ಸೆಲೆಕ್ಟು ಕಮಿಟಿಯವರು ಹೇಳಿದ್ದಾರೇ? ಈಗ ಕಾಂಗ್ರೆಸ್ಸಿನ ಪಕ್ಷದವರು ಹೇಳಿದರು ಎಂದು ಹೇಳುತ್ತಾ ತಾವು ಎಜುಕೇಷನಲ್ ಸಂಸ್ಥೆಗಳು ಎಂದು ಯಾವುದಾದರೂ ಇದ್ದರೆ ಅದಕ್ಕೂ ರಿಯಾಯತಿ ಕೊಡಬಹುದು ಎಂದು ಹೇಳುವುದು ಸರಿಯಾಗಿರುತ್ತದೆಯೇ? ಇದನ್ನು ತಾವು ಆತ್ಮ ಸಾಕ್ಷಿಯಾಗಿ ಹೇಳುತ್ತಿದ್ದೀರಾ? ಸ್ವತಃ ಜಮೀನನ್ನು ಮಾಡುವವನಿಗೆ ಇಲ್ಲಿ ಹೆಚ್ಚಿನ ಜಮೀನು ಎಲ್ಲಿ ಸಿಗುತ್ತದೆ?

ಒಂದು ವಿಷಯವನ್ನು ಸರ್ಕಾರದ ಗಮನಕ್ಕೆ ತರಬೇಕೆಂದಿದ್ದೇನೆ. ಈಗ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳು ಸ್ವತಃ ಸಾಗುವಳಿ ಮಾಡಿಕೊಂಡು ಇರುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ವಿನಾಯಿತಿ ಕೊಟ್ಟಿದ್ದೇವೆ. ಗೇಣಿದಾರರು ಮಾಡುತ್ತಿದ್ದರೆ ವಿನಾಯಿತಿ ಕೊಟ್ಟಿಲ್ಲ. ಅಂಥಾದ್ದರಿಂದೇನೂ ತೊಂದರೆ ಇಲ್ಲವೆಂದು ಹೇಳಿದರು. ಇದರಲ್ಲಿ ಕೆಲವು ಅನ್ಯಾಯಗಳು ನಡೆದಿರುವುದನ್ನು ತಮ್ಮ ಗಮನಕ್ಕೆ ತರುತ್ತಿದ್ದೇನೆ. ಅನೇಕ ರೈತರುಗಳು ಈ ಗೇಣಿದಾರರನ್ನು ಮೋಸಮಾಡುವ ಪ್ರಸಂಗ ಇದೆ. ಒಂದೊಂದು ಜಿಲ್ಲೆಯ ತುಂಬ ರೈತರ ಜಮೀನುಗಳೇ ಇವೆ. ಅದನ್ನೆಲ್ಲಾ ಆ ರೈತರೇ ಸ್ವತಃ ಸಾಗು ಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಆಗುತ್ತದೆಯೇ ? ಅನ್ಯಾಯ ಮಾಡತಕ್ಕ ರೈತರಿಗೆ ಪರ್ಸನಲ್ ಕಲ್ಟಿವೇಷನ್ ಎಂದು ಮಾಡಿಕೊಳ್ಳುವುದಕ್ಕಾಗಿ ಈ ರೀತಿ ರಿಯಾಯಿತಿಗಳನ್ನು ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರು ಕೊಡುತ್ತಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಈ ರೀತಿ ಮಾಡುವುದರಿಂದ ಗೇಣಿದಾರರಿಗೆ ತೊಂದರೆಯಾಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲವೇ ? ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರು ಈ ರೀತಿ ರಿಯಾಯಿತಿ

(ಶ್ರೀ ಎಂ. ರಾಮಪ್ಪ)

ಕೊಡುತ್ತಾರೆಂಬ ವಿಷಯ ಲ್ಯಾಂಡ್‌ಲಾರ್ಡ್ಸ್‌ಗೆ ಬಹಳಮಟ್ಟಿಗೆ ತಿಳಿದಿತ್ತು ಎಂದು ನನಗೆ ಕಾಣು ಸುತ್ತದೆ. ಅವರು ಆಗಲೇ ಏನೇನೋ ಪ್ರಯತ್ನ ಮಾಡಿದ್ದರೂ ಇವರು ಇದುವರೆಗೆ ಒಪ್ಪಿರಲಿಲ್ಲ. ಬಹಳಮಟ್ಟಿಗೆ ರಿಲಿಜಿಯಸ್ ಮತ್ತು ಚಾರಿಟಬಲ್ ಇನ್‌ಸ್ಟಿಟ್ಯೂಷನ್ನಿನವರಿಗೆ ರಿಯಾಯಿತಿ ತೋರಿಸ ದಿದ್ದರೆ ಎಲ್ಲ ಮುಂದಿನ ಚುನಾವಣೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ನಮ್ಮನ್ನು ಸೋಲಿಸುವ ಹಾಗೆ ಮಾಡುತ್ತಾರೋ ಎಂಬ ಭಯ ನಿಜವಾಗಿ ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರಿಗೆ ಇದೆಯೋ ಏನೋ ನನಗೆ ಗೊತ್ತಾಗಲಿಲ್ಲ. ಇವತ್ತಿನ ದಿವಸ ಗೇಣಿದಾರರಿಗೆ ಸಿಕ್ಕದೆ ಅವರು ನರಳುತ್ತಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಲ್ಯಾಂಡ್ ಲಾರ್ಡ್ಸ್ ಪ್ರಭಾವವೆ ಜಾಸ್ತಿ ಅಷ್ಟು ಪ್ರಭಾವ ಗೇಣಿದಾರರಿಗಿಲ್ಲ. ಈಗ ನೀವು ರೈತರ ಅದರಲ್ಲೂ ಜಮೀನ್ದಾರರ ಪ್ರಭಾವಕ್ಕೊಳಗಾಗಿದ್ದೀರಿ. ಇದು ನಿಮ್ಮ ಅತ್ಮಕ್ಕೆ ಒಪ್ಪಿದೆಯೇ ?

ಶ್ರೀ ಕಡಿದಾಳ್ ಮಂಜಪ್ಪ.—ಗೇಣಿದಾರರ ಸ್ವಾಧೀನದಲ್ಲಿರತಕ್ಕ ಜಮೀನನ್ನು ಬಿಡಿಸಿ ಕೊಳ್ಳುತ್ತಿದ್ದೇವೆಂದು ಹೇಳಿಲ್ಲ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಎಂ. ರಾಮಪ್ಪ.—ನಾನು ಈಗ ಏನು ಹೇಳುತ್ತೇನೆಂದರೆ ತಮ್ಮ ಜಮೀನು ಸ್ವತಃ ಸಾಗುವಳಿಯಲ್ಲಿದ್ದರೆ ಅಂತಹವರಿಗೆ ಒಂದು ರೀತಿ ವಿನಾಯಿತಿ ಸಿಕ್ಕುತ್ತದೆ ಎಂದು ಗೇಣಿದಾರ ರಿಂದ ಬಾಂಡುಗಳನ್ನು ತಿದ್ದಿಕೊಂಡು ಈಗ ಜಮೀನುಗಳನ್ನು ಬಿಡಿಸಿಕೊಳ್ಳುತ್ತಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಸುಮಾರು 6 ತಿಂಗಳುಗಳ ಅಥವಾ ಒಂದು ವರ್ಷದ ಹಿಂದೆ ನನ್ನಲ್ಲಿ ಜಿಲ್ಲಾ ತುಂಬಾ ಜಮೀನುಗಳಿವೆ ಎಂದು ಒಬ್ಬ ಈ ಮಾನ್ಯ ಸಭಾಸದಸ್ಯರೇ ಸೆಲೆಕ್ಟ್ ಕಮಿಟಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಹೇಳಿದರು. ನಮಗೂ ಕೆಲವು ವಿಷಯ ಗಳು ಗೊತ್ತಾಗಿವೆ. ಗೇಣಿದಾರರಿಗಂತೂ ಮೋಸ, ಅನ್ಯಾಯ ನಡೆದಿದೆ. ಈ ವಿನಾಯಿತಿ ಯನ್ನು ಜಮೀನುದಾರರಿಗೆ ಈ ಮಸೂದೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಕೊಟ್ಟಿರುವುದರಿಂದ ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರೇ ಅವರಿಗೆ ಈ ರೀತಿ ಮೋಸ, ಅನ್ಯಾಯಗಳನ್ನು ಗೇಣಿದಾರರಿಗೆ ಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಬೆಂಬಲ ಕೊಟ್ಟ ಹಾಗೆ ಇದೆ ಎಂದು ನಾನು ಹೇಳುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಆದರೆ ಈ ಸಂಸ್ಥೆಗಳು ಬಹಳ ಉತ್ತಮವಾಗಿ ಕೆಲಸಗಳನ್ನು ಮಾಡುತ್ತಿವೆ ಎನ್ನುವ ವಿಷಯದಲ್ಲಿ ಯಾವೊಂದು ಭಿನ್ನಾಭಿಪ್ರಾಯವೂ ಇಲ್ಲ. ಅದಕ್ಕಾಗಿ ನಾನು ಅವರಿಗೆ ಕೃತಜ್ಞನಾಗಿದ್ದೇನೆ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಜಿ. ಎನ್. ಪುಟ್ಟಣ್ಣ.—ಎಲ್ಲಾ ಸಂಸ್ಥೆಗಳೇ !

ಶ್ರೀ ಕಡಿದಾಳ್ ಮಂಜಪ್ಪ.—ಧಾರ್ಮಿಕ ಸಂಸ್ಥೆಗಳು ಮತ್ತು ವಿದ್ಯಾಸಂಸ್ಥೆಗಳು.

ಶ್ರೀ ಎಂ. ರಾಮಪ್ಪ.—ಧಾರ್ಮಿಕ ಸಂಸ್ಥೆಗಳು ಮತ್ತು ವಿದ್ಯಾ ಸಂಸ್ಥೆಗಳು ಸ್ವತಃ ಜಮೀನು ಇಟ್ಟುಕೊಳ್ಳುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಏತಕ್ಕೆ ಹೋಗುತ್ತವೆ ? ಭೂಮಿ ಮಾಡತಕ್ಕವನಿಗೆ ಜಮೀನು ಕೊಡಿಸುವುದನ್ನು ಬಿಟ್ಟು ಆ ಸಂಸ್ಥೆಗಳವರು ನಮ್ಮ ಹತ್ತಿರ ಇರಬೇಕೆಂಬ ಆಡಳಿತ ಪಕ್ಷದವರ ಮನೋಭಾವ ಖಂಡಿತವಾಗಿ ಸರಿಯಲ್ಲ. ಆದರೆ ಬಾಂಡುಗಳಿಗೆ ಹೆಚ್ಚು ಬಡ್ಡಿ ಕೊಡುವ ವಿಷಯ ದಲ್ಲಿ ಯಾರದೂ ಅಭ್ಯಂತರವಿಲ್ಲ. ಇದನ್ನು ಅವರ ಪಕ್ಷದವರು ಆಗಲೇ ತೀರ್ಮಾನ ಮಾಡಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಈಗ ಅಂಥಾದ್ದನ್ನು ಬದಲಾವಣೆ ಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಇವರಿಗೆ ಅಷ್ಟಾಗಿ ಸ್ವಾತಂತ್ರ್ಯವಿಲ್ಲ ಎನ್ನುವ ವಿಷಯ ನಮಗೆ ಗೊತ್ತಿದೆ. ನಿಜವಾಗಿ ಪ್ರಜಾಪ್ರಭುತ್ವವೆಂದರೆ ಏನೋ ಇದೆ, ಪಾರ್ಲಿಮೆಂಟರಿ ಸಿಸ್ಟಂ ಆಫ್ ಗೌರ್ನಮೆಂಟ್ ಇದೇನೋ ಅಡ್‌ಜಸ್ಟ್‌ಮೆಂಟ್ ಮತ್ತು ಕಾಂಪ್ರೊಮೈಜ್ ಎಂಬುದನ್ನು ಗಮನಿಸಿದರೆ ಆಗ ಪ್ರಜಾಪ್ರಭುತ್ವದಲ್ಲಿ ಸ್ವಲ್ಪ ಅನುಚರಣೆ ಬೇಕಾಗುತ್ತದೆ ಆದರೆ ಪ್ರಜಾಪ್ರಭುತ್ವದಲ್ಲಿ ಅದರ ತತ್ವಕ್ಕೆ ತಿಲಾಂಜಲಿಯನ್ನು ಕೊಡಬೇಕೆಂದಲ್ಲ. ಬಹುಮತವಿದೆಯೆಂದು ಅನ್ಯಾಯವನ್ನು ನ್ಯಾಯವೆಂದು ಮೆಜಾರಿಟಿಯಿಂದ ತೀರ್ಮಾನ ಮಾಡಿದರೆ ನಿಜವಾಗಿ ನಮಗೆ ಪ್ರಜಾಪ್ರಭುತ್ವ ಎಲ್ಲಿದೆ ಎಂದು ನಾನು ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆ ಮಾಡ ಬೇಕಾಗಿದೆ. ಸಾಮಾನ್ಯವಾಗಿ ನಾವು ಪ್ರಜಾಪ್ರಭುತ್ವವಿದೆಯೆಂದು ಏನಾದರೂ ನಾವು ತೀರ್ಮಾನ ಮಾಡಿದ್ದರೂ ಬಹುಮತದವರು ಸೇರಿ ಯಾವುದಾದರೂ ಒಂದು ಹಿತಕ್ಕೆ ಧಕ್ಕೆ ತಂದರೆ ಅದು ಪ್ರಜಾಪ್ರಭುತ್ವದಲ್ಲಿ ಅವಶ್ಯಕವಾಗಿ ಇರಬೇಕಾದ ಲಕ್ಷಣವೇ ! ಆದ್ದರಿಂದ ಮೆಜಾರಿಟಿ

ಯಾಗಲೀ, ಅಥವಾ ಮೆಜಾರಿಟಿಯಾಗಲೀ ಒಂದು ನ್ಯಾಯಕ್ಕೆ ತಿಲಾಂಜಲಿಯನ್ನು ಕೊಟ್ಟರೆ, ಪ್ರಜಾಪ್ರಭುತ್ವದಲ್ಲಿ ಅದು ಪಾರ್ಲಿಮೆಂಟರಿ ಸಿಸ್ಟಂ ಆಫ್ ಗಾರ್ನಮೆಂಟ್, ಅಥವಾ ಪಾರ್ಟಿ ತೀರ್ಮಾನವಾದ ಹಾಗೆ ಆಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಅಂದಮೇಲೆ ಅವರ ಒಂದು ಫ್ರ್ಯಾಂಕ್‌ನೆಸ್ಸಿಗೆ ನಮ್ಮ ಪಕ್ಷದವರು ವಿರೋಧ ಮಾಡಿದ್ದಾರೆಂದು ಸುಮ್ಮನೆ ಹೇಳುವುದು ಸರಿಯಲ್ಲ. ಆ ಒಂದು ತತ್ವದ ಮೇಲೆ ನಿಮಗೆ ಬಹುಮತವಿದೆಯೆಂದು ಇಂಥಾದ್ದನ್ನೆಲ್ಲಾ ಈ ರೀತಿ ತೀರ್ಮಾನ ಮಾಡುವುದನ್ನು ಬಹುಮತ ಪಕ್ಷದವರು ಈಗಲೇ ನಿಲ್ಲಿಸಬೇಕು. ಇದು ಇವತ್ತಿಗೇ ಮುಗಿಯುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ನಾಳೆ ದಿವಸ ರಜಾ ಇದೆ. ನಾಡಿದ್ದೂ ಸಹ ಈ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಚರ್ಚೆ ಮುಂದುವರೆಯುವ ಸೂಚನೆ ಕಂಡುಬರುತ್ತಿದೆ. ಆದ್ದರಿಂದ ಈ ರೀತಿ ಅವರಿಗೆ ವಿನಾಯಿತಿ ಕೊಡುವುದರಿಂದ ಬಡಜನರಿಗೆ ಅದರಲ್ಲೂ ಗೇಣಿದಾರರಿಗೆ ವಿಪರೀತವಾಗಿ ತೊಂದರೆಯಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಎಲ್ಲಾ ಗೇಣಿದಾರರಿಗೂ ತೊಂದರೆಯಾಗಲಾರದು ಎಂಬುದಾಗಿ ಒಂದು ವೇಳೆ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳು ಹೇಳಬಹುದು. ಹಾಗಿದ್ದರೆ ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರು ಈ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ನಮಗೆ ಸರಿಯಾದ ಅಂಕಿ ಅಂಶಗಳನ್ನು ಒದಗಿಸಿಕೊಡಲಿ. ಸ್ವಂತ ಸಾಗುವಳಿ ಜಮೀನೇನಾದರೂ ಅವರಿಗೆ ಇಲ್ಲದಿದ್ದರೆ ಆಗ ಮಾತ್ರ ಇವರ ತಿದ್ದುಪಡಿಯನ್ನು ಒಪ್ಪಿಕೊಳ್ಳೋಣ. ಎಷ್ಟು ಸಂಸ್ಥೆಗಳವರಿಗೆ ಸ್ವಂತ ಸ್ವಾಧೀನದಲ್ಲಿ ಸಾವಿರಾರು ಎಕರೆಗಳಿವೆ ಎಂಬುದು ನಮಗೆ ಚೆನ್ನಾಗಿ ಗೊತ್ತಿದೆ.

ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು.—ಸ್ಟ್ಯಾಟಿಸ್ಟಿಕ್ ಬಹಳವಾಗಿ ಕೇಳಿದ್ದೀರಿ. ಸುಮಾರು 3 ವರ್ಷಗಳಾದರೂ ಇವನ್ನೆಲ್ಲಾ ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರಿಗೆ ಒದಗಿಸಲು ಆಗಲಾರದು.

ಶ್ರೀ ಎಂ. ರಾಮಪ್ಪ.—ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರೇ, ಇದು ಬಹಳ ಮುಖ್ಯವಾದುದು. ಎರಡು ಲಕ್ಷ ಎಕರೆ ಉಳಿಯುತ್ತದೆಂದು ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳು ಹಿಂದೆಯೇ ಹೇಳಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಆದ್ದರಿಂದ ಇದು ಅತಿ ಮುಖ್ಯವಾದುದು. ಈ ಭೂಸುಧಾರಣೆಯ ಪರಿಣಾಮವಾಗಿ ಅಷ್ಟು ಎಕರೆ ಸರ್ಕಾರಕ್ಕೆ ಉಳಿಯುತ್ತದೆಂದು ಹೇಳಿರುವ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಅದು ಯಾವ ರೀತಿಯಾದ ಜಮೀನು, ಯಾವ್ಯಾವುದು ಎಷ್ಟೆಷ್ಟು ಎಕರೆ ಎನ್ನುವುದನ್ನು ಕ್ಲಿಯರಾಗಿ ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರು ನಮೂದು ಮಾಡಿಲ್ಲ. ಇದೇನು ಖುಷ್ಕಿ ಜಮೀನೇ ಅಥವಾ ತರೀ ಜಮೀನೇ, ಯಾವುದು ಸ್ಟ್ಯಾಂಡರ್ಡ್ ಎಕರೆ, ಅದು ಎಷ್ಟಿರಬೇಕು ಎಂಬುದನ್ನು ಮೊದಲಾಗಿ ಹೇಳಲೇಬೇಕು. ಈಗ ನನ್ನ ಮಾನ್ಯ ಸ್ನೇಹಿತರಾದ ಶ್ರೀಮಾನ್ ನರಸಿಂಹನ್ ಅವರು ತಂದಿರತಕ್ಕ ತಿದ್ದುಪಡಿ ಬಹಳ ಮುಖ್ಯವಾದುದು ಆಗಿರುವುದರಿಂದ ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರು ತಿದ್ದುಪಡಿ ಕ್ಲಾಜು (ಬಿ) ಪ್ರಕಾರ 27 ಸ್ಟ್ಯಾಂಡರ್ಡ್ ಎಕರೆ ಎಂದು ಮಾಡುತ್ತಿರುವುದನ್ನು ಒಡೆದುಹಾಕಬೇಕು ಎಂದು ನನ್ನ ಮಾನ್ಯ ಸ್ನೇಹಿತರು ಹೇಳಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಅದನ್ನು ನಾನೂ ಸಹ ಒಪ್ಪಿಕೊಳ್ಳುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಈ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ರಿಲಿಜಿಯಸ್ ಮತ್ತು ಚಾರಿಟಬಲ್ ಇನ್ಸ್ಟಿಟ್ಯೂಷನ್ನುಗಳಿಗೆ ವಿನಾಯಿತಿ ಕೊಟ್ಟಿರುವುದನ್ನೂ ಕೂಡ ತೆಗೆದುಹಾಕಬೇಕು ಎಂಬುದಾಗಿ ನಾನು ಒತ್ತಾಯ ಮಾಡಿ ನನ್ನ ಮಾತನ್ನು ಮುಗಿಸುತ್ತೇನೆ.

†ಶ್ರೀ ಕೆ. ಪಿ. ರೇವಣಸಿದ್ದಪ್ಪ (ತಿಪಟೂರು).—ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರೇ ನಮ್ಮ ಕಂದಾಯ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳು ವರ್ಷಾನುಗಟ್ಟಲೆಯಿಂದ ಈ ಲ್ಯಾಂಡ್ ರಿಫಾರಮ್ಸ್ ಬಿಲ್ಲನ್ನು ಜಾರಿಗೆ ತರಬೇಕು ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಿದ ರೀತಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ನಮ್ಮ ದೇಶದ ಮಹಾನಾಯಕರುಗಳು ಒಂದು ಬ್ರಹ್ಮಾಸ್ತ್ರವಾಗಿಟ್ಟುಕೊಂಡಿರತಕ್ಕ ಈ ಭೂಸುಧಾರಣೆಯನ್ನು ಈಗ ಹೊರಗೆ ಹಾಕಿ ವಿರೋಧ ಪಕ್ಷದವರಿಗೆ ಆ ಮಸೂದೆಯ ಮೇಲೆ ಕೂಲಂಕಷವಾಗಿ ಮಾತನಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಒಂದು ಅವಕಾಶವನ್ನು ಮಾಡಿಕೊಟ್ಟಿರುವುದರಿಂದ ನಾನು ಅವರಿಗೆ ಬಹಳ ಕೃತಜ್ಞನಾಗಿದ್ದೇನೆ. ಏಕೆಂದರೆ ಮೊದಲಿನಿಂದಲೂ ಪ್ರತಿಯೊಂದು ಚುನಾವಣೆಯಲ್ಲೂ ಭೂಸುಧಾರಣೆ ಮಾಡುತ್ತೇವೆ, ಭೂಸುಧಾರಣೆ ಮಾಡುತ್ತೇವೆ ಎಂಬುದಾಗಿ ಜನಗಳಿಗೆ ಬಹಳವಾಗಿ ಭರವಸೆಯನ್ನು ಕೊಡುತ್ತಿದ್ದರು. ಆ ಪ್ರಕಾರ ಇದೇನೋ ಸುಧಾರಣೆ ಮಾಡುತ್ತಾರಂತೆ, ನೋಡೋಣವೆಂದು ಸಾಮಾನ್ಯ ಜನಗಳು ತಿಳಿದುಕೊಂಡಿದ್ದರು. ಭೂಮಿ ಸುಧಾರಣೆ ಅಂದರೆ ಸಾಮಾನ್ಯವಾಗಿ ಖಾಯಿಲೆಯಾಗಿದ್ದಾಗ ಸುಧಾರಣೆ ಮಾಡಿದಹಾಗೆ ಇದು ಜನಗಳಿಗೆ

(ಶ್ರೀ ಕೆ. ಪಿ. ರೇವಣಸಿದ್ದಪ್ಪ)

ಅನುಕೂಲವಾಗುತ್ತದೆಂದು ಎಲ್ಲರೂ ತಿಳಿದಿದ್ದರು. ಈ ಸುಧಾರಣೆ ತೆಲುಗಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಒಂದು ಗಾದೆ ಹೇಳುತ್ತಾರೆ. ''ಅಯ್ಯವಾರಿಕಿ ವಿದ್ಯಮೂ ಲೇದು, ಗರ್ವಮೂ ಲೇದು'' ಎಂಬ ಹಾಗೆ ಇದೆ. ನ್ಯೂಸು ಪೇಪರ್ಸ್‌ನಲ್ಲಿ 18 ಸ್ಟಾಂಡರ್ಡ್ ಎಕರೆ ಎಂದು ಹೆಡ್‌ಲೈನಿನಲ್ಲಿಯೇ ಇದೆ. ಪೇಪರ್‌ನಲ್ಲಿ ನಾನು ಕೊಟ್ಟಿಲ್ಲ ಎಂದು ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳು ಹೇಳುತ್ತಾರೆ. ಇದೇನು! ನನಗಂತೂ ಅರ್ಥವಾಗುತ್ತಿಲ್ಲ. ಯಾವುದಾದರೊಂದು ಔಷಧಿಯನ್ನು ಪ್ರಯೋಗ ಮಾಡಬೇಕಾಗಿದ್ದರೆ ಮೊದಲು ಅದನ್ನ ಮನುಷ್ಯನಿಗೆ ಪ್ರಯೋಗ ಮಾಡದೆ ಯಾವುದಾದರೂ ಒಂದು ಪ್ರಾಣಿ ಮೇಲೆ ಪ್ರಯೋಗ ಮಾಡಿ ಅದರ ಗುಣವೇನೆಂಬುದನ್ನು ನೋಡುತ್ತಾರಂತೆ. ಹಾಗೇ ಈಗ ಈ ಲ್ಯಾಂಡ್ ರಿಫಾರಂಸ್ ಬಿಲ್ಲನ್ನು ತರುತ್ತೇವೆಂದು ಈಗ ನಮ್ಮ ಮುಂದೆ ಏನೋ ಒಂದು ರಿಫಾರಂ ಬಿಲ್ಲನ್ನು ತಂದು......

4-00 P.M.

ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು.—ಈಗ 'ರಿಫಾರಂಸ್' ವಿಚಾರವೆಲ್ಲಿದೆ ? ಈಗ ಸಭೆಯ ಮುಂದೆ ಚರ್ಚೆಗೆ ಬಂದಿರುವುದು 'ಸೀಲಿಂಗ್'ನ ವಿಚಾರ. ಈ ವಿಷಯದ ಮೇಲೆ ಮಾತನಾಡಿ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಕೆ. ಪಿ. ರೇವಣಸಿದ್ದಪ್ಪ.—ಸೀಲಿಂಗ್ ಮೇಲೆ ಮಾತನಾಡಲೇನು ? ಆಗಲಿ. ಆಡಳಿತ ಪಕ್ಷದವರು ಮೊದಲು ಈ ಸೀಲಿಂಗ್ ಮಟ್ಟ 27 ಸ್ಟ್ಯಾಂಡರ್ಡ್ ಎಕರೆಗಳಿರಬೇಕೆಂತ ಹೇಳಿ, ಮುಂದಿನ ಜಮೀನು ಸಾಗುವಳಿದಾರರಿಗೆ 18 ಎಕರೆಗಳಿರಬೇಕೆಂದು ಏನೋ ಒಂದು ತೀರ್ಮಾನ ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಂಡಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಅವರು ಹೇಳುತ್ತಿರುವ ಪ್ರಕಾರ ಮುಂದಿನ ವ್ಯವಸಾಯಗಾರರಿಗೆ ಈ 18 ಎಕರೆ ಜಮೀನು ಎಲ್ಲಿದೆ ? ಈ ಜಮೀನು ಯಾರಿಗೆ ಸಿಕ್ಕುತ್ತೆ? ಈ 18 ಎಕರೆ ಜಮೀನು ಯಾವ ತರಹದು, ಎಲ್ಲಿದೆ ಎಂಬುದೊಂದನ್ನು ನಿಗದಿ ಮಾಡಲು ಇಲ್ಲಿಯ ತನಕ ಯಾರಿಗೂ ಸಾಧ್ಯವಾಗಿಲ್ಲ. ಆ ಅವಧಿ ಸ್ಟೇಷನ್ನಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಪರದೇಶಿ ಕಾಂಗ್ರೆಸ್ ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು ಆಗಲೂ ಕೂಡ......

ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು.—ಆ ವಿಚಾರಗಳನ್ನೆಲ್ಲಾ ಈಗ ಏತಕ್ಕೆ ಇಲ್ಲಿ ತರುತ್ತೀರಿ ?

ಶ್ರೀ ಕಡಿದಾಳ್ ಮಂಜಪ್ಪ.—ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರೇ, ಮಾನ್ಯ ಸದಸ್ಯರು ಈ ರೀತಿ ಬಹಳ ಲಘುವಾಗಿ ಯಾವಾಗಲೂ ಮಾತನಾಡುತ್ತಿರುವುದು ಚೆನ್ನಾಗಿ ಕಾಣುವುದಿಲ್ಲ.

†ಶ್ರೀ ಬಿ. ಡಿ. ಜತ್ತಿ.—ಏನು ಮಾನ್ಯ ಸದಸ್ಯರು ಹೇಳುತ್ತಿದ್ದರೋ ಅದು ಬಹಳ ವ್ಯಂಗ್ಯವಾಗಿದೆ. ಅವರಿಗೆ ಮಾತ್ರ ತಂದೆ ತಾಯಿಗಳಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಬಾಕಿಯವರಿಗೆ ತಂದೆತಾಯಿಗಳಿಲ್ಲವೆಂತಲೇನು ಅವರ ಭಾವನೆ ? ಅವರು ಹೀಗೆಲ್ಲ ಶಬ್ದಗಳನ್ನು ಒಂದಕ್ಕೊಂದು ಬದಲಾಯಿಸಿ ಮಾತನಾಡುವುದು ಸರಿಯಾದ್ದಲ್ಲ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಕೆ. ಪಿ. ರೇವಣಸಿದ್ದಪ್ಪ.—ಪ್ರದೇಶ ಕಾಂಗ್ರೆಸ್ ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರೆಂಬುದನ್ನ......

ಶ್ರೀ ಬಿ. ಡಿ. ಜತ್ತಿ.—ಹೀಗೆಲ್ಲ ಅವರು ಲಘುವಾಗಿ ಒಂದೊಂದು ಸಾರ್ತಿ ಒಂದೊಂದು ಪದ ಉಪಯೋಗಿಸುವುದು ಸರಿಯಲ್ಲ......

ಶ್ರೀ ಬಿ. ಕೆ. ನಾಗೂರ್ (ಬಿಜಾಪೂರ್).—ಏನೋ ಅವರು ಹೇಳಿದರು. ಆದರೆ ಅದೇನೂ ಅಂಥಾ ಹೇಳಬಾರದ ಶಬ್ದವಲ್ಲ ಅದನ್ನು ಸದಸ್ಯರುಗಳು ಸ್ವಲ್ಪ ಲೈಟಾಗಿ ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳಬೇಕೆಂದು ಹೇಳುತ್ತೇನೆ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಕಡಿದಾಳ್ ಮಂಜಪ್ಪ.—ನಾವೂ ಸಹ ವಿರೋಧಪಕ್ಷದಲ್ಲಿ ಕೆಲಸ ಮಾಡಿದ್ದೇವೆ. ನಮಗೂ ಹೀಗೆಲ್ಲ ಮಾತನಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಬರುತ್ತದೆ. ನಮಗೆ ಹೀಗೆಲ್ಲ ಮಾತನಾಡಲು ತಿಳಿಯುವುದಿಲ್ಲವೆಂದು ಅವರು ಭಾವಿಸಿದ್ದರೆ ಅದು ತಪ್ಪು. ಆದರೆ ಇಲ್ಲಿ ನಡೆಯತಕ್ಕ ಕಾರ್ಯಕಲಾಪಗಳು ಒಂದು ಘನತೆ, ಗಾಂಭೀರ್ಯದಿಂದ ನಡೆಸತಕ್ಕದ್ದು ಅಗತ್ಯ. ಅದಕ್ಕೆ ಸರ್ವರೂ ಉತ್ತೇಜನ ಕೊಡಬೇಕೆಂದು ಕೇಳಿಕೊಳ್ಳುತ್ತೇನೆ.

Sri V. S. PATIL.—'*Paradesi*' means a man who comes from a foreign country.

Mr. SPEAKER.—It is an ironical word. In no sense can 'Pardesh' become 'Pradesh'.

ಆ ಅವಡಿ ಸೆಷ ಬೇಕಾಗಿಲ್ಲ. ಪ್ರದೇಶ ಕಾಂಗ್ರೆಸ್ ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರ ವಿಚಾರ ಬೇಕಾಗಿಲ್ಲ. ಈಗ ಇಲ್ಲಿ ಕುಳಿತಿರುವ ಶಾಸನಸಭಾ ಸದಸ್ಯರನ್ನು ಕುರಿತು ತಾವು ಏನು ಬೇಕಾದರೂ ಮಾತನಾಡಿ.

Sri V. P. DEENADAYALU NAIDU.—Any amount of humour would certainly be welcome ; but no insinuation as such could be tolerated; nor it would be proper. I humbly request the Chair to see that such words are expunged.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—I want to know if the Speaker wants to declare the word as unparlimentary. I am not holding a brief for Mr. Revanasiddappa.

Mr. SPEAKER.—He should not make such of it.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—He says that it must be expunged.

Sri V. P. DEENADAYALU NAIDU.–The House cannot go on indulging in these trivial matters in such from.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—Let him not cast any aspersion on the Opposition. Unwillingly he might have said it. I think my friend Mr. Revanasiddappa has as much respect for the Pradesh Congress Committee Chairman as anybody else. I do not think that Mr. Revanasiddappa ever intended it. Possibly he might have misprounced it.

ಶ್ರೀ ಬಿ. ಡಿ. ಜತ್ತಿ.—ಈಗ ಶ್ರೀಮಾನ್ ಮಲ್ಲಾರಾಧ್ಯರೇನು ಹೇಳಿದ್ದಾರೋ ಅದನ್ನು ಅವರು ಸರಿಯಾಗೇ ಹೇಳಿದರು. ಆ ಶಬ್ದಗಳನ್ನು ತೆಗೆದುಹಾಕುವುದು-ಬಿಡುವುದು ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರಿಗೆ ಬಿಟ್ಟದ್ದು. ಆದರೆ ಶ್ರೀ ರೇವಣಸಿದ್ದಪ್ಪನವರು ಹಾಗೆ ತಿಳುವಳಿಕೆ ಇಲ್ಲದೆ ಮಾತನಾಡಿದ್ದಾರೆಂಬುದನ್ನು ನಾನು ಒಪ್ಪುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಅವರು ಅನೇಕ ಸಾರ್ತಿ ಹೀಗೆ ಮಾತನಾಡುತ್ತಿರುತ್ತಾರೆ. ಅವರು ಆ ರೀತಿಯೆಲ್ಲ ದಯುವಿಟ್ಟು ಇನ್ನು ಮುಂದೆ ಮಾತನಾಡಬಾರದೆಂದು ಕೇಳಿಕೊಳ್ಳುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಅವರು ಹೀಗೆಲ್ಲ ದಡ್ಡರಾಗಿ 4-5 ವರ್ಷ ಸದಸ್ಯರಾಗಿದ್ದೂ, ಮಾತನಾಡುತ್ತಾರೆಂದರೆ ಅದನ್ನು ನಾನು ಒಪ್ಪಲು ಸಾಧ್ಯವಿಲ್ಲ.

Sri V. P. DEENADAYADU NAIDU.—When Mr. Mallaradhya says that it is regrettable, I do not have anything to say. There, the matter closes.

Mr. SPEAKER.—I am sure, the person who uttered it is not happy about it. He might have said it ironically. I am sure that the Leader of the Opposition will agree with me when I say that such words should not be used.

ಶ್ರೀ ಕೆ. ಪಿ. ರೇವಣಸಿದ್ದಪ್ಪ.—ಸ್ವಾಮಿ, ''ಕಳ್ಳನ ಮನಸ್ಸು ಉಳ್ಳುಳ್ಳಗೆ'' ಎಂತ ಅವರು ತಮ್ಮ......

ಶ್ರೀ ಬಿ. ಡಿ. ಜತ್ತಿ.-ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರೇ ಏನಿದು ? ಅವರು ಮತ್ತೆ ಕಳ್ಳರ ಮನಸ್ಸು ಎಂತ ಏನೇನೋ ಹೇಳಲು ಪ್ರಾರಂಭಿಸಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಇಲ್ಲಿ ಕಳ್ಳರು ಯಾರು ? ಹೀಗೆಲ್ಲ ಅವರು ಭಾಷಣ ಮಾಡಲು ಹೊರಟರೆ......

ಶ್ರೀ ಕೆ. ಪಿ. ರೇವಣಸಿದ್ದಪ್ಪ.—ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರೇ ತಾವು ಸಂಸ್ಕೃತ ಪಂಡಿತರನ್ನೇ ಕರೆಸಿ ಕೇಳೋಣ—ನಾನು ಹೇಳಿರತಕ್ಕ......

ಶ್ರೀ ಕಡಿದಾಳ್ ಮಂಜಪ್ಪ.—''ಕಳ್ಳನ ಮನಸ್ಸು ಉಳ್ಳುಳ್ಳಗೆ'' ಎಂದರೆ ಏನು ?

ಶ್ರೀ ಕೆ. ಪಿ. ರೇವಣಸಿದ್ದಪ್ಪ.–ಸ್ವಾಮಿ ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರೇ ಇವರು ತಮ್ಮ ಮನಸ್ಸಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಏನೇನೋ ಭಾವಿಸಿಕೊಂಡು ನಾನು ಹೇಳುತ್ತಿರುವುದೇ ತಪ್ಪೆಂತ ಅವರು ತಿಳಿದುಕೊಂಡರು-ಅದಕ್ಕೆ ನಾನು ಜವಾಬ್ದಾರನೇನು ?

ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು.—ಸ್ವಲ್ಪ ಬಿಗಿಯಾಗಿ ಮಾನ್ಯ ಸದಸ್ಯರು ಮಾತನಾಡಬೇಕು. ಏಕೆಂದರೆ 'ಪರದೇಶಿ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಿದರೆ ಮರ್ಯಾದೆ ಕಡಮೆಯಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಒಟ್ಟಿನಲ್ಲಿ 'ಕಳ್ಳರು' 'ಸುಳ್ಳರು' ಎಂಬ ಶಬ್ದ ಉಪಯೋಗಿಸುವುದು ಬೇಡ. ಘನತೆ ಗೌರವದಿಂದ ಮರ್ಯಾದೆಯಿಂದ ಸರಿಯಾಗಿ ಮಾತನಾಡ ಬೇಕು. ಬಿಲ್ಲಿನ ಮೇಲೆ ಮಾತನಾಡಬೇಕು. ನಗೆಯ ಮಾತು ಆಡುವುದು ಬೇಡ ಎನ್ನುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಆದರೆ ನಗೆ ಮಾತನಾಡುವುದರಲ್ಲಿ ಎಲ್ಲೆ ಮೀರಿ ಮಾತನಾಡಕೂಡದು. ಮರ್ಯಾದೆಯಿಂದ ಮಾತ ನಾಡಬೇಕಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಇದನ್ನು ರಿಕಾರ್ಡ್‌ನಿಂದ ತೆಗೆಯದೇ ಹೋದರೆ ಬೇರೆ ಯಾರ ಮರ್ಯಾದೆ ಹೋಗದೆ ಸಂಬಂಧಪಟ್ಟ ಸದಸ್ಯರ ಮರ್ಯಾದೆ ಮಾತ್ರ ಹೋಗುತ್ತದೆ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಬಿ. ಎಲ್. ನಾರಾಯಣಸ್ವಾಮಿ.–ಪಾಯಿಂಟ್ ಆಫ್ ಆರ್ಡರ್. ಶ್ರೀ ರೇವಣಸಿದ್ದಪ್ಪ ನವರು ಹೇಳಿರುವುದು ಯಾವ ಉದ್ದೇಶ ಎನ್ನುವುದನ್ನು ಯಾರೂ ಕೇಳಲಿಲ್ಲ. ರಿಕಾರ್ಡ್‌ನಿಂದ ಇವರ ಮಾತುಗಳನ್ನು ತೆಗೆದುಹಾಕುವುದಾದರೆ ಅವರ ಮಾತುಗಳನ್ನು ಸಹ ತೆಗೆದುಹಾಕುವುದು ನ್ಯಾಯವಲ್ಲವೇ ? ಘನತೆ ಗೌರವ ಕಾಪಾಡಿಕೊಂಡು ಮಾತನಾಡುವುದರಲ್ಲಿ ನಾವೇನೂ ಕಡಿಮೆ ಯಿಲ್ಲ, ಆದರೆ ಮಾನ್ಯ ಸಭಾ ನಾಯಕರು ಹೇಳಿದ್ದು ಸರಿಯಿಲ್ಲ.

ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು.—ಮಾನ್ಯ ಮುಖ್ಯ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳು ಎಲ್ಲರಿಗೂ ಹೇಳಲಿಲ್ಲ. ಅವರು ಶ್ರೀ ರೇವಣ ಸಿದ್ದಪ್ಪನವರಿಗೆ ಅಷ್ಟೇ ಹೇಳಿದರು.

ಶ್ರೀ ಬಿ. ಎಲ್. ನಾರಾಯಣಸ್ವಾಮಿ.–ಅವರಿಗೆ ತಂದೆ ತಾಯಿ ಇಲ್ಲ ಇವರಿಗೆ ತಂದೆ ತಾಯಿ ಇಲ್ಲ ಇದೆಲ್ಲ ಏತಕ್ಕೆ ಬರಬೇಕಾಗಿತ್ತು ? ಹೀಗೆ ಹೇಳುವುದರಲ್ಲಿ ಘನತೆ ಗೌರವ ಇದೆಯೆ ?

ಶ್ರೀ ಬಿ. ಎನ್. ಬೋರಣ್ಣಗೌಡ.–ತಂದೆ ತಾಯಿ ಇಲ್ಲ ಎನ್ನುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಅರ್ಥವೇನು ಗೊತ್ತಿದೆಯೆ?

ಶ್ರೀ ಬಿ. ಎಲ್. ನಾರಾಯಣಸ್ವಾಮಿ.—ಅರ್ಥಕ್ಕೆ ಡಿಕ್ಷನರಿ ತೆಗೆದು ನೋಡಿ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಸಿ. ಜೆ. ಮುಕ್ಕಣ್ಣಪ್ಪ.—ಕುಂಬಳಕಾಯಿ ಕಳ್ಳ ಎಂದರೆ ಹೆಗಲ ಮುಟ್ಟಿ ನೋಡಿದರು ಎಂಬುದನ್ನು ಅವರು ಅನೇಕ ಸಲ ಮಾತನಾಡುವಾಗ್ಗೆ ಹೇಳಿದ್ದಾರೆ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಟಿ. ಹನುಮಯ್ಯ.—ಬಾಯಿಗೆ ಬಂದ ಹಾಗೆ ಮಾತನಾಡುವುದು ಒಳ್ಳೆಯದಲ್ಲ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಸಿ. ಜೆ. ಮುಕ್ಕಣ್ಣಪ್ಪ.—ಅದೆಲ್ಲಾ ನಿಮ್ಮ ಪಾಠ ಏತಕ್ಕೆ ಬೇಕು ? ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು ಹೇಳಿದ ಹಾಗೆ ಕೇಳುತ್ತೇವೆಂದು ನಾವು ಒಪ್ಪಿಕೊಳ್ಳುತ್ತೇವೆ.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Order, order.

ಶ್ರೀ ಕೆ. ಪಿ. ರೇವಣಸಿದ್ದಪ್ಪ.—ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರೇ, ಕಾರಣಾಂತರದಿಂದ ಟ್ರೆಜರಿ ಬೆಂಚಿನವರ ಹುಮ್ಮಸ್ಸು ಹಾರಿಹೋಗಿದೆ ಎಂದು ಕಾಣುತ್ತದೆ. ಈ ಅಮೆಂಡ್‌ಮೆಂಟ್ ಪ್ರಕಾರ ನೋಡಿದರೆ efficient management Societies ಕಾರ್ಮಿಕರ ಸಂಸ್ಥೆಗಳು ಈ ಪದಗಳ ಪ್ರಯೋಗ ಮಾಡಿ ರುವುದನ್ನು ನೋಡಿದರೆ ಇದುವರೆಗೆ ಮಾಡಿರುವುದೆಲ್ಲ ನಿರರ್ಥಕವಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಈ ಬಿಲ್ಲು ಇದೊಂದು ಕ್ರಾಂತಿಕಾರಕವಾಗಿದೆ ಎಂದು ನಾವು ಭಾವಿಸಿದ್ದೆವು. ಆದರೆ ಇವತ್ತಿನ ದಿವಸ ಈ ತಿದ್ದುಪಡಿ ನೋಡಿದರೆ ನೀರಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಹೋಮ ಮಾಡಿದ ಹಾಗೆ ಆಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಕೊನೆಯದಾಗಿ ನಾನು ಹೇಳುವುದು ಇಷ್ಟೇ. ಟ್ರೆಜರಿ ಬೆಂಚಿಗೆ ಸದ್ಭಾವನೆ ಒಳ್ಳೇ ಬುದ್ಧಿ ಕೊಟ್ಟು ಮುಂದೆ ಒಳ್ಳೆ ನಡತೆ ಇರಲಿ ಎಂದು ಹಾರೈಸಿ ನನ್ನ ಭಾಷಣವನ್ನು ಮುಗಿಸುತ್ತೇನೆ.

†SRI C. K. RAJAIAH SHETTY (Chiknaikanhalli).—Sir, I rise to support Mr. Narasimhan's amendment. On the other day when we were generally discussing this bill, both the Chief Minister and the Hon'ble Revenue Minister displayed keen interest in ascertaining the views of the Hon'ble Members on the question what should be the ceiling area, whether it should be 18 or 20 acres. We thought they really meant business but we are disappointed. The Jatti Committee report fixes ceiling as Rs. 4,200 income. The foreign rulers created big Zamindars, inamdars and landlords but the bill seems to do little to undo the mischief. There is no point in abolishing inamdars if we are going to create another set of landlords in their place. The very purpose of land reforms would be thwarted and we would have solved nothing. I am sure the Revenue Minister did have very progressive ideas in his mind when he began with the bill, but unfortunately he is a victim of pressure politics and big landlords represented in his party have swayed over him. It is indeed unfortunate that even this reform which is coming before us at this late hour should be no reforms in the true sense. What is the use if a man can hold upto 400 acres of garden land? Is that really ceiling. If the party is really serious of introducing a socialistic pattern of society, I am sure this is not the way. Such a big ceiling is contrary to the avowed proclamations made by the party that they would wipe out the big landlords.

Referring to charitable institutions the other in reply to a question the Minister said that there are nearly 80,000 acres attached to temples. There are specific instance where a temple has got a few thousands of acres. I do not know what purpose is served if so much of land is attached to temples. The very object of this legislatian is to give employment to more people and if that object is not achieved there is no use of passing this legislation. So we should not give any exemption or even if we exempt there should be some limit to it. In my view this exemption is anti-progressive and so it should be at least restricted to a very small extent. In educational institutions there are so many communal hostels? Why should there be exemption to communal hostels? If such hostels are exempted it will only encourage communalism. So in the first instance we should not give exemption. Secondly, if this ceiling is not reduced it will not serve any purpose. What is the good of saying that future acquisitions will be limited to 18 acres and where is the chance for such acquisition? So this ceiling limit is very disgraceful to the Minister who has piloted this Bill and to the Chief Minister who is the author of the Jatti Committee Report if the limit is virtually raised from Rs. 5,400 to Rs. 10,800. It is a question of prestige of the Chief Minister as well as the party. If he cares for his prestige he should see that the ceiling is reduced. Even the Planning Commissioner has never said anywhere that the ceiling limit should be 27 acres for existing holdings and they have not said that for future acquisition it should be 18 acres. The Government have come to this figure because of the pressure of the party and the big landlords.

In this way there is no use of this legislation. You can simply have the satisfaction of passing this Bill, but it will serve no useful purpose. So I would request Government to reconsider its stand and accept Sri Narasimhan's amendment.

Sri B. N. BORANNA GOWDA.—I move a closure.

Mr. SPEAKER.—I do not know what I should do. At this stage I would call upon the Leader of the Opposition to speak. Then I would consider the closure.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—There are other members who are anxious to speak. I do not wish to speak shutting them out.

Mr. SPEAKER.—I can give a chance only to Sri Mallaradhya, We have been discussing this for nearly 4 hours.

Sri G. VENKATAI GOWDA.—We had sent amendments to the original clause.

Mr. SPEAKER.—His amendment has been disallowed and so I cannot give him a chance.

Sri G. VENKATAI GOWDA.—What about the other amendments to this clause?

Mr. SPEAKER.—They are not to sub-clause (1). When his amendments come up he can speak.

Sri C. M. ARUMUGHAM.—This is an important clause. If this is finished I do not think we will take more time. So you give a chance to us to speak on this clause.

Mr. SPEAKER.—We have discussed this for 4 hours. I would like to know from the Leader of the Opposition whether he is going to speak.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—It is a very embarrassing position for any Leader of the Opposition to agree to a closure on an important clause like this when there are several other members who want to speak. I am afraid the intention of the ruling party is to rush through in this manner.

Mr. SPEAKER.—At this speed we will not be able to finish even on the 15th.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—Is it the suggestion of the Leader of the House and the Speaker that we are adopting any obstructive tactics?

Mr. SPEAKER.—I am only anxious that it should be finished.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—Only Sri Narasimhan who moved the amendment spoke for 1 hour. My friend Sri Srinivasa Shetty spoke hardly for 5 minutes.

Mr. SPEAKER.—I want him to Speak.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—I am not anxious to speak if other members are not also allowed to speak.

Sri KADIDAL MANJAPPA.—When I moved the amendment to the definition of ceiling area in Clause 2 the same subject was discussed. We have now taken another 4½ hours for this clause. I would like to appeal to the Leader of the Opposition to bear this in mind and express his views on the amendment.

4-30 P.M.

Sri C. M. ARUMUGHAM.—Sir, this Bill was before the Joint Select Committee for one year. Now, the Minister is bringing amendments to every clause. I was told that the question of ceiling alone was discussed for five or six sittings. Now, amendments are being brought. Are we not allowed to speak on this at least for one day?

Mr. SPEAKER.—They can speak even for ten days.

Sri C. M. ARUMUGHAM.—No, no; ten days is unreasonable.

(*Laughter*)

Mr. SPEAKER.—I request the Leader of the Opposition to speak and then I will consider whether I can accept the closure motion or not. I am not in a hurry to accept it. In this case, it is much better that the Leader of Opposition offers his remarks.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—Sir, when there are many friends who are anxious to speak, I do not think, I should speak. There is a feeling that I take away much time of the House and I do not want that feeling to continue. If other friends are not given an opportunity, I will not speak and we will not take part in any other business.

Sri C. J. MUCKANNAPPA.—Sir, why should the Treasury Benches spoil the atmosphere? We will hold out a promise that we are going to pass this bill before 15th. We are not here to adopt any delaying tactics.

Sri B. D. JATTI.—Let us be clear about it. This Bill should be finished by the 14th end.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—Why is the Hon'ble Leader of the House going back? Sir, it is in your present it was agreed that we would go on 14th and 15th. Is it or is it not true, please tell me?

Mr. SPEAKER.—It does not matter so much. I would like to suggest one thing. I will keep the closure motion open for some time. It is not my intention to shut out discussion. I should like to hear the Leader of the Opposition first. I want him to speak first and then I shall think of giving a chance to others. This is an important clause and so he should have an opportunity to speak. Let him speak first and I will give a chance to others.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—Sir, in deferrence to the mandate of the Speaker, I should like to make a few observations in respect of the amendment and further amendments to the amendment of the Hon'ble Revenue Minister. Sir, looked at from any point of view, it seems to me, Clause 63 of the Land Reforms Bill before us is perhaps the

(Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA)

most important sections which deserve the fullest consideration from all sections of this House and I for one, would welcome any kind of criticism that may be made on the amendments before us. Sir, I would recall what I stated when I made general observations when this Select Committee Report was placed before this House. The Hon'ble Revenue Minister and the Hon'ble Chief Minister are both getting very touchy laterly; I do not know why? The atmosphere in which this Bill is being discussed is surcharged with a certain amount of undue interference and undue pressure and pulls, stress and strains from the Ruling Party. If the Hon'ble Revenue Minister had really taken the entire House into confidence and brought about this amendment, this Bill would have been passed in three days. Sir, almost everyday and every minute amendments come one after the other. Even now, I do not have a comprehensive list of all the amendments that have been tabled. Is it such an impossible affair to get a comprehensive picture of the amendments? Sir, this is an important Bill and it is up to the Revenue Minister to keep this amendment to the lowest minimum. Not only amendments are being sent by the Revenue Minister, but additional clauses have been added which have no bearing on the section. Section 63 is the case in point. When the definition of the word "ceiling" area came up for discussion, there was lot of discussion as the House remembers and as you are aware. There was an amendment from the opposition suggesting the ceiling as 20 standard acres, they brought an amendment putting it as 18 and we were shocked. Then, my friend the Revenue Minister, has his own mental reservation. The mental reservation was, that this 18 acres ceiling would apply to the future acquisition and 27 for the existing holdings. There are people who received this with regret and people who received this with joy.

I was one of those who read the report—the Press people would have done it in good faith, that the Mysore Government has fixed the ceiling limit at 18 standard acres. Sir, to my mind, even that 18 standard acres was excessive. Therefore I said, 20. If you will kindly see, I had first tabled an amendment as 20 acres and not 20 standard acres. Now, at this state, the Hon'ble Minister comes and says that this is 27 standard acres for existing holdings and 18 for future acquisitions. I am just asking the Revenue Minister, what is the rationale behind it and what is the justification behind this ? And why this discrimination between the existing holders and those who are likely to acquire land in the future? Is it not a case of discrimination? The main purpose and the object of this Bill is to guard the interest of the existing small holders who perhaps are a majority in the Ruling Party. Otherwise, what is it that prevailed with the Revenue Minister to change his mind. He has taken the House by surprise. It is not merely surprise, it has shocked us Sir. I had also characterised this

amendment as a fantastic amendment and the Hon'ble Revenue Minister did not place all the cards on the table. We were surprised, because there was no other State except perhaps Madras which had given a higher ceiling as 30 standard acres, but it is still being discussed on the floor of the legislature and they were honest. They were not afraid to tell the House or the world that they wanted to keep it a bit high. That is one aspect of the case.

Sir, coming to the recommendations of the Planning Commission, what did the planning commission say? They felt, and perhaps legitimately felt that the ceiling of 27 standard acres was rather high. I am asking the Revenue Minister—during his discussion with the Planning Commission did he clarify the position to the Planning Commission that what he is going to fix by way of ceiling will apply only to future acquisitions or whether it would apply to the existing holdings? I want the Revenue Minister to honestly tell this House whether this aspect was discussed with the Planning Commission or not, and if so, what were their reactions? Allegations have been made against the Minister that it is a case of double-dealing. That kind of a constrnction is possible. You will have to delete the difference that exists between the existing holders and the future holders. That is double dealing. But double dealing has a differnt meaning. I am asking the Revenue Minister even at this stage to clarify whether tried to ment ion what the intentions of his Government were or what the intentions of the Ruling Party were with regard to these two standards or double standards. Please clarify this, sothat I may understand before I proceed further. Was this aspect discussed with the Planning Commission?

Sri KADIDAL MANJAPPA.—The matter relating to ceiling was discussed with the Planning Commission. I did not give any kind of assurance or any kind of undertaking. I simply said that I will place it before the Government. I do not know what is there to hide. I discussed the matter with the Planning Commission. They advised us that the ceiling should be reduced. I have made it clear. I have distributed these things to Hon'ble Members. What is there to hide? I do not understand-I have given a plain reply.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—I do not know why the Revenue Minister is so touchy!

Sir, at the time the matter came up for discussion, I am asking the Revenue Minister to say whether he mentioned to the Planning Commission, having regard to the advice that they have tendered and having regard to the discussion that I have in my hand, at the moment relating to the discussion that they had with the Planning Commission that the Party in Power in Mysore is thinking of setting two standards for fixing the ceiling. Did he obtain their advice or not?

Sri KADIDAL MANJAPPA.—Am I bound to disclose what transpired at the meeting with the Planning Commission?

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—Sir, this is supposed to be a record relating to that discussion and it is marked 'CONFIDENTIAL'. It has been given to us. When copies of it have been distributed to the Members of the Legislature, we are perhaps entitled to know the background of this decision. The Hon'ble Revenue Minister owes a duty to this House to tell us, what were the circumstances which led to this decision. Otherwise,this paper will have to be treated as a scrap of paper on which anything is written. It is marked here as 'confidential-Planning Commission-Land Reforms Bill, dated 19-5-1961. When this document is put into our hands, I am asking if we are not entitled to know what is the background to this decision. Why I am asking all this is, Government is shifting they are vacillating, they have no fixity of mind they have no fixity of decision in regard to these matters. Some kind of pressure and somebody goes and pleads with him and he will have to oblige him. That is not the way in which Land Reforms Bill should be handled. I have congratulated the Hon'ble Revenue Minister at the beginning for coming forward with this Bill. He should not now misunderstand my *bona fides*. That is why, I wanted a clarification. He has made it a usual habit that whenever amendments are brought, he will not tell us the reasons that compelled him to bring the amendments contrary to the recommendations of the Joint Select Committee, because he was Chairman of the Joint Select Committee–when he puts forward amendments, which are at variance from the decision of the select committee, I think he owes a duty to the House to explain the circumstances. He has done nothing of the kind in regard to any amendment.

Sri KADIDAL MANJAPPA.—Sir, the Select Committee had proposed a uniform ceiling of 27 standard acres both with regard to the existing holdings and future acquisitions. I have now tabled an amendment that in the case of future acquisitions it should be 18 standard acres. It is quite in keeping with the report of the Joint Select Committee. If it was a proposal to enhance the ceiling, there was some justification for the Hon'ble Members on the side to find fault with me saying that I have changed the recommendations of the select committee. I have made an improvement to the effect that in future the normal rule should be 18 standard acres and in the case of existing holdings on the appointed day, the ceiling is 27 standard acres. It is quite in accordance with the desire of the majority of the Hon'ble Members and to that extent it is an improvement on the report of the Joint Select Committee.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—Sir, this is a point about which there is a lot of difference. With all due deference to the capacity for reasoning displayed by the Revenue Minister, I must say that this suggestion of 18 acres which is claimed to be an improvement, I say, it is a retrograde step, and it will keep people in confusion. It is a retrograde step taken. If it is 18 acres all round, I would have been the first to accept to congratulate him. But the position is very clear. He cannot take credit and say that his amendment is by way of

improvement. By no stretch of imagination can anybody come to the conclusion that what is suggested by the Hon'ble Minister and supported by the Hon'ble Chief Minister, is an improvement over the recommendation of the Joint Select Committee. Certainly not. I do not wish to say, like my Hon'ble friend Sri M. Ramappa that the public has been hood-winked and that the public has been deceived and defrauded. But this is a fact that the public has been grossly misled. They were expecting a better state of affairs. They were fondly expecting seriously that the implementation of the Land Reform Bill which was passed here, they would get an acre more, or half-an-acre more than what was expected. The intention is very clear. If the Minister is trying to make us believe that he has achieved wonders by bringing this amendment, he would be committing a mistake.

Sri KADIDAL MANJAPPA.—I never claimed that I achieved wonders.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—If you achieve your objective in trying to introduce land reform in this State, it would amount to that. Sir, looked at from another point of view, at no stage has the land reform Bill been complete with facts and figures which are material to the case.

What is the category of land that two lakhs of acres represent; is it category No. 1; how much of it. If it is all the categories, what is the distribution ? Should not the Honourable Members of this House be informed as to the correct situation ? How can they offer remarks. Even granting that 2 lakhs of acres will be available for distribution, the acid test of the efficacy of the Bill, of the implementation of the Bill is, what is the total extent that becomes available to landless labour and to dispossessed tenants and to those who have no land or who are anxious to take up cultivation. How many acres of land would be distributed; under what category; is it all under the last category ? ಕಾಡು-ಮೇಡು ಕಲ್ಲು-ಮುಳ್ಳು ಇರತಕ್ಕ ಜಮೀನೇ ಅಥವಾ ಯಾವ ತರಹ ಜಮೀನು ಬರುವುದು To me it seems from the amendment brought by the Revenue Minister that he is compelled to do this, actuated by a spirit of grabbing on the part of the ruling party to get the best that could be got out of the Land Reforms Bill. He has regretted the pressure put upon him, because he has rendered himself helpless in a situation like this. He made a very frank confession to the House and he could not have made a franker confession. What is it, shall I say ? 'After all, I am a tool in the hands of the Party.'

Sri KADIDAL MANJAPPA.—I said that I am implementing the programmes of my party.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—At least, that is the impression conveyed in my mind. At every stage, there is an attempt to see that the effects of the Bill are neutralised.

In regard to the amendments brought by my friends, I wish to support the amendment of Mr. Basave Gowda. In respect of plantations, the Revenue Minister suggests that if a gentleman is a planter, to him, even in respect of existing holders, the ceiling limit should be 18 and

(Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA)

not 27 acres. I am asking, what is the purpose. I am sure the Revenue Minister will get up and say that Mr. Mallaradhya is championing the cause of capitalists. Not at all. As part of the policy of my Party, I have openly been in wholehearted sympathy with the move to exempt plantations altogether from the purview of ceiling. I have had very valid reasons and my reasons have been backed by the Centre and my party so far as the policy of the party is concerned. I have nothing to be ashamed of. I am not going to yield to any pressure of this kind. I look to it from the point of view of national industry which we cannot neglect and particularly in Mysore State where the plantation industry is perhaps more than 70-75 per cent of the platation in India. With what special object the Revenue Minister fixed the ceiling in respect of the existing holdings at 18 acres? Why this variation; why this different norm for the planters?

Sri KADIDAL MANJAPPA.—At the appropriate time I will answer. Every time I cannot be expected to give an explanation.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—Then I am at liberty to make any remarks. He wanted to mislead the public by saying 'Because we have shown some concession to the planters here, we are going to make a restriction. "When you allow thousand acres to planters and exempt them, why should be niggardly for the balance of 9 acres? It is a case of discrimination. Tomorrow he can file a writ petition before the Highest Court. This is discrimination of the worst sort. Whatever lands he has got interspersed he uses for growing paddy and distributes the paddy grown to the labourers at concession rates. I know in a number of plantations paddy is sold at 5 seers a rupee as against the existing market which will come to hardly 2½ seers per rupee; he is not making profit. The Plantation Survey Committee which went into the question has clearly stated whatever paddy fields interspersed in plantations are not a source of profit. Having regard to this factor, where is the justification for restricting it. I will wait for the explanation that the Honourable Minister may offer at the end.

I invite attention to the amendment of Sri Basave Gowda suggesting the addition of item (iv) after item (iii) of the Explanation:

> "(iv) In determining the ceiling limit under this section, forest land and land exclusively used on the appointed day, for grazing the cattle of the holder of the land or on which trees have been raised for better cultivation of the land, shall not be taken into consideration to the extent of thirty acres."

Did this matter come up at any time before the Select Committee and if so, what was the decision taken? I should like to know if this reflects the opinion of the Select Committee. In regard to this matter, I have got to raise one or two points. It is true that in this proviso he says if there is any grass or other produce grown, if such produce is sold, such

land shall be taken into consideration for determinig the ceiling limit. Supposing, of the thirty acres proposed to be exempted, 20 acres is utilised for growing grass and he sells grass for a profit. Because there are certain areas in Mysore where only grass is grown and people make a living. I know of a farm in Mysore where from the grass alone a particular landlord makes Rs. 2,500 to 3,000 a month. The Revenue Minister is aware as to whose land I am referring to. In Mysore Taluk, Mr. Viraraj Urs, Retired Finance Secretary to Government, owns land in which he does nothing but grows grass and makes money. He made up the loss that he incurred on account of his association with Gopala Rao in liquidating the debt. I am not taking off my hat, but I am talking of particular instances. In such case how much of it will be taken into consideration in regard to the fixing of ceiling. The whole thing becomes so much complicated. I am inclined to consider that this is one of the clauses where you are going to give a lot of handle to unscrupulous people to harass the poor landholder. This particular clause has been brought in without much discussion, without understanding the implications. Supposing it is a case of trees grown entirely due to the efforts of the landholder how much are you going to assess as a ceiling limit in a case of this kind. Forty cocoanut trees perhaps are going to be planted per acre in certain areas of the State.

5-00 P.M.

Supposing he has grown in 10 acres out of the 30 acres, cocoanuts how are you going to calculate the ceiling limit ? The whole thing is divorced from practical politics. It is difficult to assess the quantum to be added or to be removed from the ceiling area. If you want the cattle wealth of the country to be developed, how are you going to restrict that portion of the land on which grass is grown. In every taluk, in every hobli, in every village, there is no more gomal land after your generous policy of giving land to people who are anxious to get land. There are not even 30 acres of land for every 100 heads of cattle as required under the law and even there when the man is trying to improve his cultivation and improve his agriculture, you are going to put a ceiling limit. The whole thing seems to be ill-concieved. Why should 30 acres be given ? Why should 30 acres be left to him. The real point is who are these people who are going to have private forest lands and grazing lands. They are the big, prosperous landlords and not the small holder. Is it to favour the big landlords you have brought this amendment ?

ಶ್ರೀ ಕಡಿದಾಳ್‌ಮಂಜಪ್ಪ.—ಇದು ನಾನು ತಂದ ತಿದ್ದುಪಡಿಯಲ್ಲ. ಇದನ್ನು ಸೆಲೆಕ್ಟ್ ಸಮಿತಿಯವರ ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯದ ಪ್ರಕಾರ ತಂದಿದೆ. ಇದರಲ್ಲಿ ಅಂಥ ವೈಯುಕ್ತಿಕ ಉದ್ದೇಶವೇನಿದೆ ? ನಾನು ಸರ್ವಾಧಿಕಾರಿಯಾಗಿದ್ದರೆ ತಾವು ಹೇಳುವಂತೆ ಮಾಡಬಹುದಾಗಿತ್ತು...

ಶ್ರೀ ಜೆ. ಬಿ. ಮಲ್ಲಾರಾಧ್ಯ.—ತಮಗೆ ಅಂಥ ಒಂದು ಅಧಿಕಾರವನ್ನು ಕೊಡಲಾಗಿತ್ತು. ಇದು ಅತಿ ಮುಖ್ಯವಾದ ವಿಷಯ. ಇಂಥ ವಿಷಯದಲ್ಲಿ ತಮ್ಮ ಮನಸ್ಸು ಏತಕ್ಕೆ ಹಿಂಜರಿಯಿತು ಎಂಬ ಒಂದು ಶಂಕೆಗೆ ಇಲ್ಲಿ ಆಸ್ಪದವಿದೆ ಎಂಬುದು ಎದ್ದು ಕಾಣುತ್ತದೆ. I wish it is false,

(Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA)

Coming to the question of orchards and efficiently managed farms. When the question of definitions came. I wanted the word orchard and efficiently-managed-farm to be defined. The Minister said that he would consider the matter later. He also said whether it is clarified in the form of a definition of an explanation it does not matter. To me it seems that there is a lot of difference between a definition and an explanation. Unless you define these things in a suitable manner, it is likely to lead to a lot of difficulty in the interpretation by a munsiff, who is a one-man tribunal for adjudication of these cases. What is the difficulty in defining. Everything is to be prescribed under the rules. When less important matters have come up within the scope of the definition clause, I want to know why orchards and efficiently-managed farms have been omitted. ಯಾರೋ ಒಬ್ಬ ನಾಲ್ಕು ಸೀಬೆಗಿಡಗಳನ್ನೊ ಅಥವಾ ನಾಲ್ಕು ದಾಳಿಂಬೆ ಗಿಡಗಳನ್ನೋ ಅಥವ 4 ಪಪಾಯಿ ಗಿಡಗಳನ್ನೊ ಬೆಳಸಿದ್ದರೆ Do you call it an orchard? ಅಥವಾ ಯಾರಾದರೂ ಪರಿಶೀಲನೆಗೆ ಹೋದಾಗ ಅವು ಒಣಗಿ ಹೋಗಿವೆ ಎಂತ ಕೆಲವು ಬುಡಗಳನ್ನು ತೋರಿಸಿದರೆ ಅದು ಆರ್ಚರ್ಡ್ ಆಯಿತೆ ! You have got to define. After all, the man who has got to a adjudicate has to have something to fall back upon. He cannot decide in a vacuum. I personally fell that this is giving a lot of scope to people who will misuse this clause unless we define these two words.

Coming to your amendment in regard to Clause 6. What is the significance of the amendment which the Hon'ble. Revenue Minister moved. Is it after the ameudment or before. What is the significance of the expression "less than the ceiling area". is it 18 acres or is it 27 acres.

Sri KADIDAL MANJAPPA.—Ceiling area is mentioned here in Clause 63. For existing holdings 27 and for future acquisitions 18.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—The ceiling area is defined in Clause 2 as 18 acres. If your amendment is with reference do 18 acres, do you still hold that it may mean 27 acres.

Sri KADIDAL MANJAPPA.—In the case of existing holdings, it will amount to 27 acres.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—Ceiling area means 18 acres for future acquisition, 27 for the existing holdings. ಹಾಗಾದರೆ ನಿಮ್ಮ ಡೆಫನಿಷನ್ ಕ್ಲಾಜಿಗೆ ಮತ್ತೆ ತಿದ್ದುಪಡಿ ತರುತ್ತೀರಾ ?

Sri KADIDAL MANJAPPA.—Clause 1 of the proviso relate to general ceiling. The second clause refers to existing holdings on the appointed day.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—Coming to Clause 63 (7) looking at the attitude of both the Chief Minister and the Revenue Minister I think they are likely to bring an amendment to the term "other institutions".

Sri KADIDAL MANJAPPA.—Yes.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—In this matter though I have a lot of friends belonging to religious institutions. I cannot understand why the Minister agreed to this amendment in this form. Can he ever imagine any mutt or religious institution saying that they are cultivating all the thousands of acres personally ? Is there any chance for doing that ?

Sri B. D. JATTI.—If there is some institution cultivating lands personally exceeding the ceiling limit, then the exemption will operate.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—You are keeping one particular institution in mind and bringing this amendment. That institution must be well aware that they are trying to get over the provisions of this Bill.

Sri B. D. JATTI.—Perhaps there are no such institutions.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—You will remember that when I offered my preliminary remarks I asked, is it the intention of the Minister to bring a separate Bill to regulate the properties held by charitable institutions and educational trusts because it is not the intention on this side and also on the other side to starve institutions whih are devoted to educational advancement of the State. In such cases there is justification for exempting them altogether from the provisions of the ceiling, but what is the justification for other categories. I cannot understand. Is it in consonance with your avowed object of making this a secular State ? I happen to be a number of the priestly order myself and there is lot of pressure on me from various sources, but in dealing with lakhs of people who are landless labourers, other considerations should not come in. We have the highest respect for people who are presiding over the mutts, but in a matter like land reforms such considerations cannot come in. I would, therefore, suggest that it is better that the powers of these educational institutions and the way in which they are going to devote the proceeds of their lands are defined so as to make it possible to see that their funds are not diverted for other purposes than contemplated in the provisions of this Bill. If you allow the Bill to be passed as it is, what are the steps that you are going to take to prevent misuse of the concessions extended to them. So far as tenants are concerned even the head of the mutt can never interfere with their rights because they become virtually the landowners, but what about other cases where they are likely to misuse. Suppose they say they are cultivating 1,000 acres personally.

Sri KADIDAL MANJAPPA.—If you concede that they cannot interfere with the lands in the possession of tenants, then the answer is simple. At present except the ceiling provision there is no law which prohibits accumulation of any land by religious or charitable institutions. If they mismanage their properties, the ordinary law now in force will apply.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—You have defined personal cultivation in Clause 2. Is any personal cultivation contemplated by any Swamiji?

Sri KADIDAL MANJAPPA.—We have enlarged it to include companies and institutions. We have also said that no tenant should be evicted from the lands and those tenants would become occupants of the land after the appointed day.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—Unless some provision is made in the Bill itself so as to prevent religious institutions from misusing the concessions extended to them by this clause. I am afraid it is not going to benefit anybody. I can understand the activities of educational institutions, but you must find some way to restrict the operations of the other institutions. You have not defined charitable and religious institutions in this Bill.

Sri G. VENKATAI GOWDA.—Are they registered under any Act?

Sri KADIDAL MANJAPPA.—Some of them are registered under the Societies Registration Act and some are not.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—Then you say "religious and charitable institutions registered under any Act in force in the State."

Sri KADIDAL MANJAPPA.—Some of the mutts are not registered and there is no law which compels them to get registered.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—Do you mean to suggest that under the Muzrai Act temples do not come?

Sri KADIDAL MANJAPPA.—They come, but there is no provision to register them as envisaged under the Companies Registration Act.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—The word "person" having been defined in this Bill to mean and include a company or a co-operative society, why should this not apply to them also? Sir "person" includes a company, family, association or other body of individuals whether incorporated or not, and any institution capable of holding property. Then, how do you say that a temple does not come within the purview of this Act.

Sri KADIDAL MANJAPPA.–It comes under the Society of Registration.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—Will you kindly see that they come under this Act itself? Sir, I am reminded in this connection, of some educational institution which come up like mushrooms stating that they would start schools in the rural parts. I had the occasion to deal with some of such institutions. Applications will be called for to be sent along with two rupees. They open the first year, and even after two years the second year is not started. This has become a source of profit to such people. I do not want such people to get the benefit. Where it is an institution or a Mutt or a temple which sincerely serves the cause of education, I will be the first person to agree to this. I do not know why our Chief Minister who had the affiliation with the erstwhile Bombay Government, now the Maharastra Government, does not take inspiration from the provisions of the Maharastra Bill.

Sir, I want to invite attention to the new clause which is introduced by my friend Mr. Narasimhan. I hope the Hon'ble Minister has read it. Mr. Narasimhan says, if the land gets additional importance by a new Government source of irrigation what should happen. What is contemplated in Section 75 is, if the land appreciates in value as a result of the efforts made by himself and the members of the family, which has no bearing by the amendment brought by my friend. I hope the implications are undertood correctly.

Sri KADIDAL MANJAPPA.—Section 63 operates in all cases excepting in Section 75. In cases where a person on his own effort converts the value of the land into a higher value, he need not surrender.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—There is no reference in 75 to the appreciated value of the land due to the additional source of the Government.

Sri KADIDAL MANJAPPA.—If a dry land becomes wet land, as a result of the steps taken by Government, then the ceiling clause operates and he will have to surrender the excess area.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—Sir, I am very emphatic. Neither in Section 63 nor in 64, has any reference been made to the increased value of the land as a result of any Government irrigation. There is nothing to show either by implication or otherwise.

Sri KADIDAL MANJAPPA.—63 is applicable always. It comes into operation whenever the extend of land held by any person exceeds the limit prescribed in 63 and he is liable to surrender the excess to Government under 65.

5-30. P.M.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—Sir, I do not wish to be more dogmatic than I have been so far. I leave it to you. But kindly see if there is any thing in what I say. Beyond that, I cannot say anything. I am very emphatic-neither 63, 64 nor 75 ever contemplates cases where land increases in extent. The Hon'ble Revenue Minister gave a very ingenous explanation. If the value of the land increases on account of the personal efforts, nobody can force him to surrender. If the increase is due to any Government sources of irrigation, should you not provide for that ?

Sri KADIDAL MANJAPPA.—I have given a very reasonable and correct interpretation of Section 63, 65 and 75. 63 is always applicable to all persons. When there is excess, he will have to surrender. 75 is an exception to that. Only in two cases, he need not surrender. Beyond this, what can I say ?

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—Sir, in regard to proviso to sub-clause (1) - 6 additional acres. 5 additional acres is the amendment suggested by Sri M. C. Narasimhan. I want to know what is the reasonable objection of the Revenue Minister. I wish I had time enough to move another amendment in respect of that 4 standard acres. You have

(Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA)

shown consideration to small holders and want to increase the small holder's possession to four standard acres instead of a basic holding as defined originally. We are coming back to the small holder again, I suppose. Now why should not restrict it to four standard acres instead of 6 in the proviso to clause 1. I consider this to be a very reasonable amendment and must be accepted if your motive is clear.

As suggested by my Hon'ble friend Sri Ramappa, you know the yield from four standard acres and that too getting double crop ? Why don't you reduce it to four standard acres ? Is there any reasonable justification for fixing it so high as five acres ? From the point of view of additional land being available, I support that amendment Sir.

In regard to computation of the ceiling area I should like the Hon'ble Revenue Minister to clarify what exactly is this 'efficiently managed farm'. Because, unless there is a very clear definition both in regard to orchard and efficiently managed farm, it is likely to lead to undesirable results. Section 63 from your point of view is the appropriate section where you have come to a decision. I think that when you give me a reply, you will consider this matter seriously.

Before I close, once again, I wish to invite the attention of the Hon'ble Revenue Minister to the several observations made on the floor of the House by Hon'ble Members notably on this side in regard to the fixation of ceiling and reduce it to the lowest pitch. I consider that even now, wiser counsel may prevail and our Revenue Minister may think of having the same ceiling for the existing holdings and also future holdings. He will earn the gratitude of hundreds of people and I am sure that there will be a large number of acres of land available for distribution; and the real objectives of the Bill will have been served. But if on a matter of prestige, you want to stick to 27 acres, you will make a mockery of this Bill and if this section is not implemented and if it does not appear in proper manner, the whole Bill will be doomed to failure.

†Sri V. S. PATIL.—Sir, I must thank you first of all for giving me this opportunity to speak on this important provision. We have thoroughly discussed this matter when we were in the Joint Select Committee. But at that time also, my views were quite distinct and I have mentioned them in my dissenting note that ceiling proposed by the Joint Select Committee was rather too high and it should be reduced. The Planning Commission also appears to be of the same view and ultimately our Revenue Minister was pleased to reduce it to 18.

But by some other means he wants to maintain again 27 acres. These are strange. I do not want to traverse the same grounds which have been placed before this House by other Honourable Members. One of the main purposes of the Bill is to increase the agricultural production When we give the extended land to the existing holders, are they going

to increase the production? Is there any provision to that effect. Supposing the average yield is so much and if the average gross yield goes down, then the land will have to be taken back by the Government. If there is no provision to that effect, what is the use of merely extending the acrage of the land to the existing land holders. We have the bitterest experience during the last ten years that we are in deficit so far as the agricultural production is concerned. We are spending crores of rupees every year for importing even foodgrains and if there is no restriction on holding and for getting back the lands by the Government if the production goes down, I think all these Nawabs will be sleeping on their lands carelessly. If the Revenue Minister wants to give any facility to the existing holders, then he must impose the condition that the production must be higher than what it is now. That will be one of the things under which we can reconsider the proposal of increase. But instead of doing that, he wants simply to favour some of the big people and extend the area which they are already holding. This is not justifiable on the grounds of national income, on the grounds of social justice. So I submit that 27 acres should not be allowed and only 18 acres which we have now passed, should be in force at least for some time. Let us see what will be its effect.

Secondly, the result of these 27 acres will be, if there is no restriction or enforcement of increasing the production, this will amount to merely dog and manger policy. The big landlords will go on sleeping there, they themselves will not work on the land to increase the production, nor do they allow others to to do same. This policy must not be there so far as national interests are concerned. Lastly, by this amendment we will be doing a great injustice. Just a few minutes back, there was great flutter in our House about the word 'Paradesh' By allowing this amendment, we are turning so many peasants, actual cultivators as well as tenants to be 'paradeshis'. So I appeal to the Government, in order to have justice to all, don't press for these amendments of increasing the area when we definitely know that these big landholders or other owners are doing nothing except they are creating a sort of distinction between higher level and lowyer level in our society and it has resulted in the least growth in the agricutlural produce.

The last thing to which I should refer is about the amendment moved by my friend and which was argued by the Leader of the Opposition very efficiently. The Minister is a lawyer; the Chief Minister also is a lawyer. When a vested right in property is to be taken out from any person, there must be a clear condition in the Bill or in the Act to extinguish that existing right. No right can be extinguished by mere inference. If there is no provision under which we can curtail the rights of these people, no court of law of any cadre will hold that by implication of Sections 63, 65 and 75, all these put together, the inference will be that the man will have to surrender. This is sheer nonsense so far as lawyers are concerned. We can argue this to deceive

(Sri V. S. PATIL)

the public but not the courts. So the amendment brought by Mr. Narasimhan is quite essential. Let the Government bring specific amendments to any of these clauses so that whenever any improvement in the classification is done at the cost of Government, then the owner will have to be liable to surrender the land. There must be a specific provision for extinguishing any existing rights and no rights can be extinguished merely by inference. So I submit that Government should come to their senses in order to have a definite law and not to leave it for inference. With these remarks I close my speech.

†Sri KADIDAL MANJAPPA.—Mr. Speaker, Sir, I have listened to the debate very carefully. The first objection raised with regard to my amendment is that I propose to enhance the ceiling area by means of this amendment. Honourable Members must be aware that the Jatti Committee Report suggested that in the case of existing holdings a higher ceiling limit should be prescribed. In the Hyderabad area, there is a simlar provision that 4½ times the family holding is the ceiling area in respect of existing holdings on the appointed day. Therefore, it is nothing new. On the other hand, as I submitted earlier, my amendment is an improvement on the Report of the Select Committee. It is very well known that the Select Committee suggested that the ceiling area should be 27 standard acres both for the present holdings. After taking into consideration the views of the Honourable Members of this House. I have proposed that in the case of existing holdings under personal cultivation, the ceilings area should be 27 standard acres and in other cases. It should be 18 standard acres. Therefore, there is no justification for the argument that the amendment is a retrograde step.

Sri G. VENKATAI GOWDA.—Can there be two ceilings ?

Sri KADIDAL MANJAPPA.—In some of the enactments there are two ceilings. Particularly, I have referred to the Hyderabad Act which is now in force.

With regard to the ceiling limit, Honourable Members were pleased to observe that the ceiling area is very high. Under the Hyderabad Act, the area of the family holding ranges from 21 acres to 60 acres, ordinary acres. In some regions, family holdings will consists of 64 ordinary acres. In Andhra both for the existing holdings and for future holdings, 27 standard acres is the ceiling area. In Madras it is 30 standard acres. Therefore, ours is much better though I would appreciate the arguments of Honourable Members that the ceiling area should have been 18 standard acres both for future and present holdings. But taking into account the feelings in the House and taking into account the condition of the agriculturist and the condition of bankers, industrialists and businessmen, all these things, I have agreed that in the case of present holding, it should be 27 standard acres.

I am for lands reforms. So long as in other sectors people are allowed to amass unlimited wealth without any restriction, it would be

rather difficult for me to say that I should not accept the views of the majority of the members.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—Why not postpone land reforms if that is the view.

Sri G. N. PUTTANNA.—Are you thinking of restricting the income in other sectors in the near future ?

Sri KADIDAL MANJAPPA.—Yes, in course of time. ಸುಮ್ಮನೆ ಒಬ್ಬರ ಮೇಲೊಬ್ಬರು ಈ ರೀತಿ ಹೇಳುವುದರಿಂದ ಪ್ರಯೋಜನವೇನೂ ಆಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ, the suggestion of the Planning Commission is that in case the family is large, they should have double the ceiling area. That has been incorporated in the amendment.

In regard to the amendment of my friend Sri Narasimhan that in cases where Government undertakes irrigation projects, there should be specific provision to the effect that the excess area should be surrendered clause 75 is an exception to the general rule. The general rule is that after the appointed day, nobody can hold more than a ceiling area. In cases where Government undertakes irrigation projects, automatically the ceiling area will increase after the dry land is converted into wet land the landlord is liable to surrender the excess area. There is no difficulty.

Sri G. VENKATAI GOWDA.—Is he required to surrender in such cases under clause 75 ?

Sri KADIDAL MANJAPPA.—We have mentioned in clear terms that the provision of clause 63 will be applicable to the existing holdings as if the ceiling area were 27 standard acres. There is no point of defrauding or hood-winking anybody. Somebody said we are hood-winking the Planning Commission. The Planning Commission is not so ingnorant to be hood-winked, by you or by me. We have said in clear terms that in the case of existing holdings the ceiling is 27 acres.

ಶ್ರೀ ಜೆ. ಬಿ. ಮಲ್ಲಾರಾಧ್ಯ.—ಯಾವುದು ಇದರಲ್ಲಿ ಆ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಕ್ಲಿಯರಾಗಿ ಹೇಳಿ. ಇಷ್ಟೇ ಎಂದು ಸರಿಯಾಗಿ ಇಲ್ಲಿ ಬಾಯಿಬಿಟ್ಟು ಹೇಳಿ. ಸುಮ್ಮನೆ ಯಾರೋ ಹೇಳಿದರು ಎಂದರೆ ಅರ್ಥವೇನು ?

Sri KADIDAL MANJAPPA.—It is not with a view to hood-winking the Planning Commission. It is deliberately incorporated.

In the case of plantations, if the Hon'ble Members refer to my amendment to clause 104, it would be found that we have exempted the plantations. Under the advice of the Planning Commission, lands required for ancillary purposes and land interspersed within the boundaries of the Plantation are not subject to ceiling and in addition they have been allowed to retain 100 acres as reserve for future development. Therefore they should be satisfied with one ceiling area.

In regard to the explanation, it is for the Government to make rules in regard to what is heavy investment and permanent structural

(Sri KADIDAL MANJAPPA)

improvements. The words "compact areas" are used by the Planning Commission and in other enactments also similar wordings are used. The word "reasonable" was inserted by the Select Committee.

Sri V. SRINIVASA SHETTY.—But the Planning Commission has not used the word "reasonable." Why should that word be used now ?

Sri KADIDAL MANJAPPA.—If we insert the word 'contiguous in some cases there may be difficulty because some stream may intervene or a road may come inbetween two blocks. In such cases the word 'reasonable' would clear the position.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—Compactness is a question of fact. It is either compact or it is not. What is 'reasonably compact'. It looks so unreasonable. It is not English.

Sri KADIDAL MANJAPPA.—So far as we are concerned it appears to be reasonable.

In the case of religious and charitable institutions, I have repeatedly said that they are not permitted to resume lands from the tenants. They will be allowed to cultivate lands in their possession without any ceiling limit. That is the recommendation of the Planning Commission. No doubt this is a secular country but for sometime we have to respect the feelings of people who are religious. It is not to the disadvantage of the tenants. Tenants are not displaced.

Mr. SPEAKER.—The question is :

"That in the proposed sub-clause (2) the words 'other than a person holding land cultivated by plantation crops' shall be deleted."

The amendment was negatived.

Mr. SPEAKER.—In the proposed item (*d*) of sub-clause (5) the word "reasonably" shall be deleted and the word "contiguous" shall be added after the word "compact."

The motion was negatived

Mr. SPEAKER.—The question is :

"That in the proposed clause :—

(1) The proviso to in sub-clause (1) for the words may hold six additional' the words 'may hold five additional' shall be substituted."

(2) Sub-clause (2) shall be deleted.

(3) Sub-clause (3) shall be deleted.

(4) Sub-clause (5) shall be deleted.

(5) A new sub-clause shall be added at the end of proposed clause :—

"If as a result of irrigation from a source constructed by Government any land held by a person after the appointed day is converted into any class of land mentioned in Schedule I Part A, and thereby the holding of the person exceeds the ceiling area, the land so in excess shall be deemed to be surplus land and accordingly the provisions of this Act shall apply to the holding."

(6) In the proposed sub-clause (6) of clause 63 the following Explanation shall be added :—

Exempted land shall mean land exempted under section 63 (5)."

The amendment was negatived.

Mr. SPEAKER.—The question is :

(7) "That for sub-clause (1) the following sub-clause shall be substituted :—

(1) No person either by himself or, if he has a family or is a member of a joint family, together with any other member of his family or of the joint family, as the case may be, shall, whether as a land-owner, landlord or tenant or as a mortgagee with possession or otherwise, or partly in one capacity and partly in any other, hold land in excess of the ceiling area :—

Provided that where the number of members of the family of such person or of the joint family of which such person is a member exceeds five, he or the joint family, as the case may be, may hold six additional standard acres for each member in excess of five, so however as not to exceed twice the ceiling area in the aggregate.

Explanation :—In the case of a company, an association or any other body of individuals, the celing limit shall be one ceiling area.

(2) In the case of any person holding land on the appointed day, other than a person holding land cultivated by plantation crops, the provisions of sub-section (1) shall apply as if the ceiling area were twenty-seven standard acres.

(3) In determining the ceiling limit under this section, forest land and land exclusively used on the appointed day, for grazing the cattle of the holder of the land or on which trees have been raised for better cultivation of the land, shall not be taken into consideration to the extent of thirty acres :

Provided that when any such land ceases to be used for the said purpose, or is used for any other purpose, or the grass or other produce grown thereon is sold, such land shall be taken into consideration for determining the ceiling limit.

(4) In the case of any person holding land cultivated by plantation crops, the ceiling limit in respect of other land held by him shall be determined taking into consideration the agricultural land referred to in item (3) of the Explanation to section 104 "

(8) Sub-clause (2) shall be renumbered as sub-clause (5) and in sub-clause (5) as renumbered :—

(i) for the words, figure and brackets "sub-section. (1)"the words, figures and brackets "sub-sections (1) and (2)"shall be substituted.

(ii) item (*a*) with the explanation shall be deleted and

(iii) items (*b*), (*c*), (*d*) and (*e*) shall be relettered as items (*a*), (*b*), (*c*) and (*d*) respectively.

9. After sub-clause (5), as renumbered, the following sub-clauses shall be added :—

(6) "Where a person holds both land exempted under clauses (*c*) or (*d*) of sub-section (5) (hereinafter called 'exempted land') and other land (that is, land which is not so exempted), then :—

(*a*) if the area of exempted land is less than ceiling area, he shall be entitled to hold so much only of other land as together with the area of exempted land, equals the ceiling area; and in such case, in relation to the holding of that person, such area shall be deemed to be the ceiling area:

(*b*) in any other case, he shall not be entitled to hold any land which is not exempted land.

(7) Nothing in this section shall apply to any land held.

6-00-P.M

By a religious, charitable and other institution capable of holding property where such land is cultivated personally."

The amendment was adopted.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Next amendment No. 145 may be moved.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—We shall stop now. It is 6 o'Clock.

Mr. SPEAKER.—We shall finish consideration of this clause and then rise.

Sri C. J. MUCKANNAPPA.—We have been sitting from 12 o'clock to 6 o'clock.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—There are a number of members who want to go to their houses.

Mr. SPEAKER.—If the consideration of this clause is not over today, day after to-morrow members will take one hour for it.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—I give an assurance to the Hon'ble Speaker that we will not take much time.

Mr. SPEAKER.—The House now rises and will meet day after to-morrow at 1 P.M.

The House adjourned at Ten Minutes past Six of the Clock to meet again at One of the Clock on Thursday, the 14th September 1961.